Challenges to the College and the College System

Background Papers

Responses Papers ...

VISION 2000

Empirical Features
of the
College System

Background Papers

Vision 2000
A Review of the Mandate of the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology

VISION 2000

January 1990

91-00153/

Vision 2000 is a review of the mandate of Ontario's Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. It is coordinated by the Ontario Council of Regents and was initiated by the Minister of Colleges and Universities in October of 1988.

A Steering Committee, with broad-based representation, was established to guide the Vision 2000 process. Consultation, with a wide variety of stakeholders, and research was handled by five study teams. Study Team 1's task was to provide an empirical snapshot of the current college system and its external environment. Researchers from Study Team 2 examined the role of colleges in our changing economy, while Study Team 3 looked into ways that the college system could promote access and educational support for diverse learners. Study Team 4's purpose was to study the challenging interrelationships of quality, accessibility and efficiency. For Study Team 5 the research and consultation focussed on the linkages between colleges and other educational institutions.

The background papers in this volume are part of a number of publications by researchers prepared for Vision 2000. These papers do not necessarily represent the views of the Study Teams, the Vision 2000 Steering Committee, or the Ontario Council of Regents.

Together the background papers are meant to provide a broad base of ideas as part of the input for the deliberations of the study teams and the Steering Committee.

Ontario Council of Regents
Ministry of Colleges and Universities
790 Bay Street, 10th Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5G 1N8

(416) 965-4234
Fax: (416) 963-1278

Ontario

Communications Coordinator
Catherine Clement

Colleges
and the
Communities

Background Papers

Responses Papers ...

Norman Rowen

Most Things to More People

Harv Honsberger

Themes and Implications: A Report on the Visions from the College System

---

Irene Ross

Mini Scanning the Future

January 1990

Study Team 4 Members

Chair
Keith McIntyre

Executive Officer
Harv Honsberger

Members
George Allan
Terry Dance
Maureen Dey
Roy Giroux
Garth Jackson
Jay Jackson
Bill Kuehnbaum
Frank Lockington
Richard Marleau
Pat McNeil
Norman Rowen
Karen Shaw
Adam Sugden
Bill Summers
Helmut Zisser

Challenges to the
College and the
College System

Background Papers

Norman Rowen

Most Things to More People

Study Team 4

Summary

The purpose of this paper is to provide a summary of responses to the discussion paper "Pressures for Change, Opportunities for Development" prepared for Study Team 4. The main vehicle for soliciting responses to the paper was through the regional focus group discussions. While originally designed to be held in four locations, circumstances dictated seven meetings which took place in May and June. In total, over three hundred people took part in these discussions including college administrators, faculty, support staff, students and members of boards of governors.

The responses are reported in two main sections. The first concerns a number of 'objectives' (some might be termed values, others goals) that were the subject of discussion and around which there appears to have been, in large measure, a consensus emerging from the focus groups. In total, fourteen major propositions are put forward that may be seen to summarize the discussions and provide a focus for the study team's further deliberations. (These are cited immediately below.) The second section reports on some of the features that appear to be most important (or contentious) in meeting these objectives. (See the body of the report for these features.) A final brief section offers some of the questions which come most directly from the focus group responses which are posed to further the study team's discussions.

Participants overwhelmingly voiced the view that access has been and must continue to be a major (if not the major) goal (or value) of the colleges. This was seen as crucial in adjusting to two of the main pressures identified in the discussion paper; namely, technological and demographic changes. Both pressures were interpreted by the participants as providing the opportunity for the colleges to assume a leadership role in addressing the 'lifelong learning' needs of all members of their communities.

Participants were generally agreed on four basic objectives as fundamental to their view of access to the colleges.

First, that access be defined as the opportunity to succeed, rather than merely enrol. Participants overwhelmingly acknowledged the significant implications this would have for the provision of 'academic support systems,' which they viewed as necessary to realize this goal.

Second, the majority of participants put forward their desire for access to be essentially 'open.' By this most would like to see their college's offerings available to all in their community, irrespective of prior education. This was acknowledged to require a commitment to a number of 'front end' academic services including (a) assessment of prior experience and education, (b) appropriate program counselling and placement and (c) appropriate preparatory and upgrading activities.

It must be noted that participants were clearly of the view that assessment should be for the expressed purpose of program placement, and not used simply as a means to exclude potential learners from pursuing their goals. In addition to the three services cited above, most participants suggested that the 'opportunity to succeed' objective includes a fourth service; namely, the availability of remediation, when necessary, as part of the college's ongoing support. (This was frequently cited as aiding the objectives of maintaining, or enhancing, quality and efficiency as well as access.)

A third objective is the general agreement that each college should be as comprehensive as possible with respect to its offerings; having a range of both program areas and levels of difficulty available in the local community.

The fourth objective is the need for each college to maintain (or enhance) their ability to be 'flexible' and 'responsive' to local needs of both individual learners and local employers.

Consensus emerged on three major goals related to the quality of college offerings.

First, the organization and delivery of programs in the colleges must reflect a consensus that the colleges adopt a broader notion of 'education,' rather than a narrower concept of 'training,' with greater focus on general education and programs aimed at providing learners with 'generic skills.'

Second, enhancing quality will require improvements in the 'critical mass' including (a) better student preparedness (through front end academic services) and (b) up-to-date college resources (including HRD for college employees, updated equipment and development of relevant curricula in a variety of delivery forms).

Third, participants were generally agreed on the need for (or benefits from) system-wide standards. While many participants wish to see variations in the specific content and delivery of programs, the prospect of considerable variations in quality is viewed as clearly undesirable. This would include (a) system-wide entry and exit standards, (b) consistent course and program requirements recognized and supported by both internal and external stakeholders and (c) processes for the evaluation of programs on a regular basis. Participants were clearly of the view that system-wide initiatives should guide, rather than dictate, curriculum and delivery decisions.

Three major goals were put forward by participants related to the efficiency and funding of college programs.

First, that the system must ensure that funding is adequate to what the colleges are expected to provide; including explicit funding for initiatives required to meet the access and quality objectives (e.g., assessment, remedial and preparatory services; curriculum and human resource development; the inclusion of general education and generic skills content into all programs).

Second, the system should provide greater stability and coordination of funding. To many, this would include reducing the relationship between enrolment and funding, coordinating government funding sources and providing adjustments to encourage part-time enrolments. Among the features discussed, there was considerable interest in a 'grant-levy' system for funding the upgrading and adult training activities, perceived to be necessary for human resource development of the provincial labour force as a whole.

Third, increasing efficiency was seen to accompany increases in retention (from preparatory and remedial activities); from the consolidation of selected offerings (e.g., those specialized programs with highest costs); and from the development of alternative delivery forms, especially to meet the needs of part-time learners.

With respect to structure, organization and governance (and decision-making), four major goals or principles appear to represent a majority of participants' views of what is desirable.

First, participants clearly expressed a preference for a system which would retain 23 colleges each having a considerable degree of autonomy. This view, however, is contingent on the assumption (or desire) that significant differences would not exist between colleges in areas which would effect quality, access or efficiency.

Second, participants similarly expressed a strong preference for a central coordinating role in a number of areas; including (a) academic (policy) changes in areas where quality and access might differ considerably if coordination were absent (e.g., general education, generic skills, assessment, preparatory and remedial offerings, curriculum and human resource development, and program review); (b) specialized programming, including new initiatives in higher level training and program consolidation owing to enrolment and/or cost pressures; (c) determining a framework for providing equivalencies to facilitate access for part time (especially adult) learners, including transfers between programs, colleges and universities; and (d) relationships between the colleges, collectively, and other stakeholders, (including employer and industry associations, unions, professional associations), particularly concerning the certification of graduates and/or accreditation of programs.

Participants viewed the challenges of college autonomy and system-wide coordination as complementary, not contradictory, principles.

Third, participants urged that the colleges embody the value of cooperation, rather than competition (both among colleges, and between colleges and other providers, including a clear delineation of the appropriate role of private trainers).

Fourth, participants felt strongly that decision-making structures at all levels should assure appropriate participation of stakeholders — both internal and external to the colleges — and that processes be developed to allow the system to be essentially self-governing. This was urged of both local college as well as coordinating structures.

Questions posed for further consideration include: (1) how to 'broaden' offerings in an effort to enhance quality; (2) the areas for system-wide coordination on academic policies; (3) possible structures to reconcile local decision-making and system-wide coordination; and (4) possible processes to involve major stakeholders representing both internal and external constituencies. The major question posed by the focus groups concerned whether a system-wide body would be limited to an advisory role or be vested with authority to make decisions in clearly defined areas.

With respect to the process itself, the process was viewed as overwhelmingly positive. The frustrations of time and difficulty aside, participants were nearly unanimous in their appreciation for a process designed to encourage reflection on the nature of the college system in an open-ended exercise of this type.

Sommaire

Ce document résume les réponses au texte « Pressures for Change, Opportunities for Development » présenté au groupe d'étude 4 pour discussion. Les réactions à ce texte ont été recueillies principalement lors de réunions de groupes régionaux. Initialement fixé à quatre, le chiffre des réunions est passé à sept, en mai et en juin. Plus de trois cents personnes y ont pris part, parmi lesquelles des administrateurs, des enseignants, du personnel de soutien et des membres de conseils d'administration de collèges.

Les réponses sont réparties en deux sections. La première porte sur plusieurs « objectifs » soumis à discussion (dont on pourrait qualifier certains de valeurs, d'autres de buts) et sur lesquels il existait en général un consensus au sein des groupes. En tout, quatorze propositions majeures sont formulées qui offrent en quelque sorte la synthèse des discussions et l'objet des délibérations futures du groupe d'étude. Ces propositions sont reprises ci-après. La deuxième section aborde quelques-uns des aspects les plus importants ou les plus controversés de la poursuite de ces objectifs. (Voir le corps du texte.) Le document se termine sur une série de questions issues des réactions des groupes régionaux, qui doivent servir à alimenter les futures discussions du groupe d'étude.

Les participants ont presque tous insisté sur le fait que l'accès est et doit rester l'un des principaux, sinon le principal but (ou la principale valeur) des collèges. Ceci est perçu comme essentiel pour remédier à deux des grands problèmes soulevés dans le texte, à savoir le changement technologique et l'évolution démographique. Il ressort que les participants perçoivent ces problèmes comme une possibilité pour les collèges de donner l'exemple en satisfaisant les besoins d'apprentissage que les membres de leurs communautés ressentent tout au long de leur vie.

Les participants sont dans l'ensemble convenus sur la délimitation de quatre objectifs fondamentaux pour aboutir à ce nouveau modèle d'accès aux collèges.

Le premier objectif est de définir l'accès comme la possibilité de réussir à un cours ou à un programme, et non seulement de s'y inscrire. Les participants reconnaissent dans leur grande majorité l'étendue des conséquences de cette définition sur les « services de soutien aux apprenants », qui leur semblent essentiels pour atteindre cet objectif.

Le deuxième objectif est que l'accès soit essentiellement « ouvert ». La plupart des participants aimeraient que les services offerts par les collèges soient accessibles à tous les membres de la communauté, quel que soit leur niveau d'éducation. Ils reconnaissent que cela nécessite un effort particulier pour améliorer les services aux apprenants avant le commencement des cours, notamment (a) une meilleure évaluation de leur expérience et de leur niveau de scolarisation; (b) des services d'orientation et de placement convenables; et enfin (c) des activités adéquates de préparation et de mise à niveau.

Il faut noter que les participants étaient d'avis que l'évaluation doit servir à placer les apprenants dans un programme et non pas à les en exclure, ce qui reviendrait à les empêcher d'atteindre le but qu'ils se sont fixés. La plupart des participants étaient d'avis que pour offrir la « possibilité de réussir », les collèges devraient prévoir, en plus des trois services énoncés ci-dessus, un autre service permanent pour ceux qui en ont besoin, à savoir des cours de rattrapage. Ceci est généralement perçu comme favorable à l'objectif de maintenir ou d'améliorer la qualité et l'efficacité des programmes, de même que l'accès.

Un troisième objectif, qui a fait l'unanimité, est que chaque collège offre, à l'échelle de la communauté locale, une gamme de cours aussi complète que possible pour ce qui est des matières et des niveaux de difficulté.

Le quatrième objectif est que chaque collège reste sensible aux besoins des apprenants et des employeurs locaux et fasse preuve de souplesse dans sa réponse à ces besoins.

Les participants se sont mis d'accord sur trois objectifs principaux liés à la qualité des services offerts par les collèges.

Premièrement, l'organisation des programmes et leur exécution dans les collèges doit refléter le consensus demandant que les collèges s'éloignent d'une politique trop restreinte de formation en faveur d'une politique plus vaste d'éducation et qu'ils mettent l'accent davantage sur l'enseignement général et les programmes qui visent à développer chez les apprenants des aptitudes de base.

Deuxièmement, la hausse de la qualité des services des collèges doit passer par l'amélioration de la masse critique, y compris (a) une meilleure préparation des apprenants (par le biais de services qui leur sont offerts avant le début des programmes) et (b) l'actualisation des ressources des collèges (en offrant des cours de perfectionnement à leurs employés, en les dotant d'équipement de bureau moderne et en multipliant les options pour les programmes d'études pertinents).

Troisièmement, les participants se sont dans l'ensemble accordés à reconnaître les avantages de normes identiques pour l'ensemble du système et la nécessité d'adopter pareilles normes. Quoique de nombreux participants aimeraient que des modifications précises soient apportées au contenu et à l'exécution des programmes, ils tiennent tous à éviter des variations majeures dans leur qualité. Ils sont donc très attachés à (a) des normes universelles pour l'accès au système et la sortie; (b) des exigences uniformes pour les cours et les programmes, reconnues et approuvées par toutes les personnes concernées, internes et externes au système; (c) la mise en place de processus permettant d'évaluer les programmes à intervalles réguliers. Les participants étaient clairement d'avis que ces initiatives générales du système devraient guider, plutôt que dicter, la prise de décisions concernant les programmes d'études et leur mise à exécution.

Les participants ont également défini trois objectifs concernant l'efficacité des programmes collégiaux et leur financement.

Le premier objectif est que le système veille à ce que le financement soit adéquat par rapport au mandat des collèges; les participants sont en faveur de subventions spéciales pour les initiatives nécessaires pour atteindre les objectifs ayant trait à l'accès et à la qualité (par exemple les services d'évaluation, de rattrapage et de préparation; le développement des programmes d'études et des ressources humaines; l'incorporation de cours portant sur l'enseignement général et les aptitudes de base dans tous les programmes).

Le deuxième objectif est que le système assure une plus grande stabilité et une meilleure coordination du financement. Beaucoup sont d'avis que pour ce faire, il faudrait diminuer le rapport entre les inscriptions et l'aide financière, coordonner les sources de financement gouvernementales et prévoir des ajustements pour favoriser les inscriptions à temps partiel. Parmi les mesures mises à discussion, celle qui a suscité le plus d'intérêt est l'adoption d'un système de subvention-prélèvement pour financer les activités de perfectionnement et de formation des adultes, estimées indispensables au développement des ressources humaines pour l'ensemble de la main-d'oeuvre de la province.

Le troisième objectif, à savoir l'amélioration de l'efficacité, a été perçu comme corollaire d'une hausse du taux de persévérance (grâce aux services de préparation et aux cours de rattrapage); du regroupement de certains services (par exemple des programmes les plus coûteux); et de la mise en place de nouvelles options d'études, en particulier pour satisfaire aux besoins des apprenants à temps partiel.

En ce qui concerne la structure, l'organisation et la régie (voire la prise de décisions), quatre objectifs ou principes majeurs semblent résumer ce que préconise la majorité des participants.

Premièrement, les participants se sont clairement exprimés en faveur d'un système qui serait composé de vingt-trois collèges bénéficiant chacun d'une large autonomie. Cet objectif est cependant indissociable de l'hypothèse (ou du souhait) qu'aucune différence majeure n'existe entre les collèges dans tout ce qui joue sur la qualité, l'accès ou l'efficacité.

Deuxièmement, les participants ont montré une préférence marquée pour une coordination centrale dans un certain nombre de domaines, notamment (a) des changements de politique en matière de programmes là où la qualité et l'accès risquent de varier considérablement en l'absence d'une telle coordination centrale (par exemple en ce qui a trait à l'enseignement général, aux aptitudes de base, à l'évaluation, aux services de préparation et de rattrapage, au développement des programmes d'études et des ressources humaines et à la révision des programmes); (b) la mise en place de programmes spéciaux, y compris aux niveaux d'études supérieurs et la fusion des programmes en fonction des taux d'inscription et des coûts; (c) la mise en place d'une structure permettant d'établir des équivalences qui faciliteraient l'accès des apprenants à temps partiel (en particulier les adultes), y compris des transferts entre programmes, collèges et universités; et enfin (d) le renforcement des liens entre tous les collèges et les personnes concernées (y compris les associations professionnelles, les regroupements d'employeurs et les syndicats), en particulier en ce qui concerne l'octroi de certificats de fin d'études ou l'agrément des programmes.

Selon les participants, l'autonomie des collèges et de la coordination générale à l'échelle du système sont des principes complémentaires et non contradictoires.

Troisièmement, les participants ont exprimé le vif souhait que les collèges donnent un exemple d'attitude coopérative plutôt que concurrentielle (que ce soit entre collèges ou entre les collèges et d'autres fournisseurs de services, avec une délimitation claire et nette du rôle à juste titre réservé à ceux qui fournissent de services de formation dans le secteur privé).

Quatrièmement, les participants préconisent sans équivoque la participation de toutes les parties concernées, internes ou externes aux collèges, aux différentes étapes de prise de décision, ainsi que l'adoption de méthodes permettant une quasi-autonomie du système. Les responsables des différents collèges et les personnes chargées de la coordination ont abondé dans ce sens.

Les questions soulevées pour les discussions à venir sont les suivantes : (1) comment élargir la gamme des services pour en améliorer la qualité; (2) comment définir les domaines soumis à une coordination à l'échelle du système pour ce qui a trait aux politiques d'enseignement; (3) quelles structures mettre en place pour réconcilier la prise de décision locale et la coordination générale; et enfin (4) comment organiser la participation des représentants des principales parties concernées, qu'elles soient internes ou externes au système. La question primordiale posée par les groupes de discussion est celle de savoir si un organe coiffant l'ensemble du système se verrait confier un rôle strictement consultatif ou s'il serait investi du pouvoir de prendre des décisions dans certains domaines bien définis.

Malgré ses lenteurs et ses difficultés inhérentes, les participants ont dans l'ensemble reconnu le mérite de ce processus ouvert destiné à stimuler la réflexion sur la nature du système collégial et sur la façon d'y apporter des changements.

Table of Contents

Page

Introduction 1

Goals and Objectives 2

- Access 2
- Quality 4
- Efficiency (including Funding) 6
- Structure, Organization and Governance (and Decision-Making) 8
- A Final Note on Objectives 10

Some Possible Features 11

- Access 11
- Quality 13
- Efficiency and Funding 14
- Structure, Organization Governance and Decision-Making 16

Some Additional Questions 17

- A Final Note 18

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to provide a summary of responses to the discussion paper, "Pressures for Change/Opportunities for Development".

The main vehicle for soliciting responses to the paper was through the regional focus group discussions. While originally designed to be held in four locations, circumstances dictated seven meetings, which took place in May and June, 1989. In total, over three hundred people took part in these discussions, including college administrators, faculty, support staff, students and members of boards of governors.

A few comments should be offered about the process of producing this summary.

In reporting on the responses to the paper, it is important to note that this cannot be a fully 'objective' rendering. As participants were not selected by Vision 2000 in any systematic way, it would not be useful to provide a 'tabulation' of responses. Study Team 4 did, however, provide guidelines for the selection of participants, and the composition indicates the balanced and comprehensive representation of all college participants. In addition, the process was explicitly designed to be more 'open ended,' with no provision to guarantee that participants dealt with the same issues or in the same depth.

However, what follows is intended to be a faithful summary of the discussions of the various groups, based on their reports and the observations of the Vision 2000 staff who were present for varying periods of time in each of the groups. The participants were organized into a total of 27 groups, each of which produced a summary of its discussion (through the facilitator/recorder's notes). Some of the discussion was reported to the whole group in an hour long plenary session at the end of each day's meeting. In total, more than 250 pages of notes were 'digested' in order to provide the summary which follows. (Different recorders and reporters might have given different emphases to their groups' discussions. In addition, a different author might have summarized the volume of discussion reports, which are offered here in summary, differently as well.) To the extent that participants are able to find their perspectives in what follows, this might be considered an 'accurate' report. It is also, however, intended to offer a synthesis of views on major issues; a process made more practical by agreement on aspects of several recurring themes.

With respect to the process itself, participants were asked to evaluate the day and their involvement. On the basis of these evaluations, the process was, overwhelmingly, viewed as positive. The frustrations of time and difficulty aside, people were nearly unanimous about participating in a day designed to encourage reflection on the nature of the college system, including features they do not routinely have the opportunity to examine, and the future of the colleges in an open-ended exercise of this type. In their evaluations many wrote of the diversity of participants and perspectives, and of their desire to see such opportunities open on a more regular basis, at both a college and a system level.

(There was some feeling, limited to a few participants in each meeting, that the discussion paper — and by extension, Study Team 4 — were predisposed to a more central model. This was quite unfortunate given that the study team wished to balance different alternatives for the purpose of these discussions, and participants were assured that the team had not reached any such conclusions. Most participants, however, found the paper generally to have been a provocative and useful tool. There were some people who thought it would have been more useful it if had been shorter, less dense in its language and if the alternatives, particularly the third, had been less complicated.)

Having said this, the different levels of discussion made the responses somewhat difficult to characterize and summarize. Most felt, perhaps rightfully, that there simply wasn't enough time to develop the directions they were getting to (but that they couldn't have done much more on the given day). This was partly a problem of spending time on the three models as given (i.e., explaining and discussing, which most thought extremely useful), partly of the different levels of 'system' understanding, and partly a function of perhaps not pushing harder for participants to develop a limited number of themes in more depth. Despite the diversity within each of the groups and in participants as a whole, it is important to note that the experience provided for considerable consensus on some major objectives (and values) and some clearer distinctions about how to achieve some of these goals. It can be noted, however, that some groups generated long lists of specific likes and dislikes with respect to the models presented in the paper, while others focussed on generalizations about the directions they hope the system will follow. This of course, makes generalizing somewhat more difficult, given such different kinds of response. Hopefully, what follows will indicate the range (and strength) of views on some issues as well as the areas of greatest agreement, if not consensus.

Finally, this summary is but one input to the study team in its deliberations. While many of the principles and specific proposals offered in the focus groups may be endorsed by the team, there may be a need to consider some of the harder choices that will emerge from the many sources available to the team. The views reported here can, hopefully, provide some clarity to the team's discussions.

The responses are reported in two main sections. The first concerns a number of 'objectives' (some might be termed values, others goals) that were the subject of discussion and around which there appears to have been, in large measure, a consensus emerging from the focus groups. The second section reports on some of the features that appear to be most important (or contentious) in meeting these objectives. This is likely to be more useful than attempting to recount responses to either the assumptions or models as offered in the paper, and is probably a more accurate reflection of the substance of most groups' discussions. A final brief section offers some of the questions which come most directly from the focus group responses. It is hoped that these, too, will contribute to the study team's continued discussions.

Goals and Objectives

The following section offers a synthesis of the focus group discussions grouped under the main headings of access, quality, efficiency and structure, organization and governance. These four topics have been the focus of study team discussions and it is probably most beneficial to report the main findings of the focus group discussions around these topics. While the terms 'goals' and 'objectives' have been used, some may understand the positions summarized below as 'values' or 'principles' around which the system may choose to act. While appreciating that some differences in usage may be important, the terms, as used here, are interchangeable. In total, fourteen major propositions are put forward that may be seen to summarize the discussions and provide a focus for the study team's further deliberations.

Access

Participants overwhelmingly voiced the view that access has been and must continue to be a major (if not the major) goal (or value) of the colleges. This was seen as crucial in adjusting to two of the main pressures identified in the discussion paper; namely, technological and demographic changes. There was general agreement that the colleges have a commitment to provide programs that offer students and employers the means to deal effectively with technological change and, particularly, the applications of technology to the provision of goods and services. Coupled with changes resulting from economic and corporate restructuring in many industries, adapting to changes in technology, both 'hard' (the application of automated processes to the production of goods and services) and 'soft' (changes in the organization of production and relationships within the enterprise), is understood to require periodic updating and retraining for a broad cross section of the labour force. This process, which has been described as a process of 'lifelong learning' by some and the development of a 'training culture' by others, is seen to require the commitment of employers and governments, as well as individual learners. Fundamentally, however, its main effect on the colleges was noted to be a requirement to provide access for learners at many different points in their working lives.

Related to this is the increasing proportion of adult learners who will (or should) access the colleges. The demographic changes discussed, coupled with a commitment to lifelong learning, suggest that college programs must be made available to larger numbers of adults whose abilities to respond to change can become a major focus of the system. While not wishing to neglect the role that the colleges play in preparing a significant proportion of secondary school graduates for the labour market, the declining proportion of this cohort, together with technological changes, led most participants to suggest that the colleges will continue to feel pressures to enhance access for older and more diverse populations.

Having said this, participants were generally agreed on four basic objectives as fundamental to the system.

First, that access be defined as the opportunity to succeed, rather than merely enrol. This, of course, has significant implications for the provision of what some participants termed 'academic support systems' which they viewed as necessary to make this goal a practical, rather than merely a rhetorical, commitment.

Second, the majority of, but not all, participants put forward their desire for access to be essentially 'open.' By this most would like to see their college's offerings available to all in their community, irrespective of prior education. This was acknowledged to require a commitment to a number of 'front end' academic services in order for the diversity of potential learners to be accommodated at a level of quality and efficiency that participants viewed as similarly important. These services include (a) assessment of prior experience and education, (b) appropriate program counselling and placement and (c) appropriate preparatory and upgrading activities.

It must be noted that participants were clearly of the view that assessment should be for the expressed purpose of program placement and not used simply as a means to exclude potential learners from pursuing their goals. Most participants felt that this would require the provision of adequate preparatory offerings to assist learners in reaching the levels necessary in order to progress to their chosen programs.

A minority of participants viewed such an objective as unrealistic. While subscribing to the need for rigourous assessment of potential learners, these participants suggested that quality and efficiency criteria would necessarily limit access to those most capable and that other providers (be they secondary schools, community groups or others) should be responsible for any preparatory activities needed to assist potential applicants to reach the required entry levels.

In addition to the three services cited above, most participants suggested that the 'opportunity to succeed' objective includes a fourth service; namely, the availability of remediation, when necessary, as part of the college's on-going support. (This was frequently cited as aiding the objectives of maintaining, or enhancing, quality and efficiency, as well as access.)

A third related objective concerned the scope of programs offered. Participants were generally agreed that each college should be as comprehensive as possible with respect to its offerings. While it was acknowledged that some specialization has occurred and will be necessary, most participants suggested that the goal of access would be severely compromised, particularly for increasing numbers of adult learners with either jobs or families (or both) who will need and choose to further their education, if colleges were not comprehensive. In addition, where quality and/or enrolment considerations require that only a limited number of colleges can offer a particular program, participants suggested that specific provisions be made for access, through residences, mobility allowances or alternative forms of delivery. Such situations, however, were thought to constitute a distinct minority of college offerings and enrolments and an exception to the principle of colleges being as comprehensive as possible.

It should be noted that few participants expressed the view that their college (or the system as a whole) should be structured 'to do fewer things better,' as this was perceived to contradict the need to serve local communities by offering the widest possible array of opportunities for the development of learners. The minority view (to limit the range of offerings available at each college) suggested that quality suffered when 'resources are spread to thin' and that, given their perception of the likely levels of funding, colleges could become 'centres of mediocrity' by attempting to be comprehensive. Most participants, however, sought to address this problem with reference to quality and funding, rather than through limiting access.

The fourth access related objective was the need for each college to maintain (or enhance) their ability to be 'flexible' and 'responsive' to local needs. Many participants cited the need to find 'community' as a central element in the colleges' mandate. While there were a number of specific examples offered, as an objective, flexibility and responsiveness can be seen to have two major dimensions. First, a desire to see access for individual learners increased through a variety of features aimed at accommodating part-time study (including scheduling, assuring the equivalency of part-time and full-time offerings, developing alternative modes of delivering courses, granting credit for prior education and experience, etc.); in short, through developing an explicit orientation and commitment to access and support for part-time and lifelong learning.

Second, participants expressed a desire to see the colleges remain (or become) responsive to important constituencies in their local communities. This was put forward by many as a weakness of any move toward greater 'centralization' and, conversely, as a strength of 'local autonomy.' In its positive form, the notion of responsiveness suggests the ability to address the needs of local employers and, in many cases, to do so quickly. Some suggested that this objective requires that local colleges have autonomy with respect to all program approval decisions; others, that resources were needed to develop better local labour market information and planning; still others, that the collective agreement needs to provide for flexibility in allocating faculty. Common to all, however, was the view that, as a goal or objective to be considered in how the system might be structured, the ability to respond to local needs ought not be sacrificed for greater 'system' efficiency. (This should not simply be seen as representing a fear of bureaucratic inefficiency; but, rather, a genuine desire to see that decision-making about what is offered and to whom does indeed rest with local colleges. This may also be viewed in relation to those who perceive local labour markets and employers as having a short-term perspective, not necessarily consistent with the colleges' responsibility to provide learners with the firm grounding required to sustain them through the many changes they may face. In addition, it should be noted that this view of 'responsiveness' relates to access to college offerings and does not imply any particular view of standards or quality. Stated differently, respondents were not suggesting local 'standards' as a consequence of the ability of a college to respond to local needs.)

By way of summary, while there were minority views on each of these objectives, the majority of participants advocated (1) a definition of access as the opportunity to succeed, not merely to enrol; (2) a commitment to 'open' access, with the required supports; (3) that each college be as comprehensive as possible with respect to the range of programs offered; and (4) that colleges be structured so as to be as flexible and responsive as possible to their local communities, including individuals, groups and employers.

Quality

From the discussions in the focus groups, consensus emerged on three major goals related to the quality of college programs which a majority of participants viewed as central to a renewed mandate for the system. (It should again be noted that some suggestions for how these might be achieved are found in the Features section below.)

First, the organization and delivery of programs in the colleges must reflect a consensus that the colleges adopt a broader notion of 'education,' rather than a narrower concept of 'training.' Such a goal would have significant implications for college offerings by mandating a focus on general education and (to many, but not all, participants) the development of 'core' curricula and programs aimed at providing learners with 'generic skills.' While these latter concepts need much further specification, there was a clear sentiment that employers want, and learners need, a broader base of knowledge, skills and abilities in their fields in order to contribute at a higher level and meet the challenges of competitiveness. The view was strongly expressed that a broader education would provide a more sound basis for continued (lifelong) learning and the updating and upgrading of skills likely to be necessary for most workers in most enterprises. In addition, the need to adapt to technological change, whether 'hard' (the application of automated processes to the production of goods and services) or 'soft' (changes in the organization of production and relationships within the enterprise), are perceived to require a higher level of knowledge and skill. These include skills in communications, problem solving, flexibility and adaptability that will provide workers with the ability to understand new situations and apply their skills in meeting those challenges, thereby enabling them to grow and develop with their firms. To do so, most participants felt strongly that a 'broadening' of program content is required.

A second major goal concerns the notion of 'critical mass,' or the resources that are brought to the educational enterprise. These can be thought of in two main areas: what learners bring and what the college provides. With respect to the former, most participants wish the colleges to provide access to all members of their communities. However, access to particular programs must be conditional on having attained a level that will enable learning to take place effectively. Toward this end, participants felt strongly that entry standards must be set 'high' and that the 'front end' academic services (cited above) be provided in order to address what many view as a problem of student preparedness. In addition, most participants see that some need will exist for remediation during the program itself and urge that this, too, must be explicitly provided for. The resources required to provide such academic opportunities are viewed, by the vast majority of participants, as an investment in both the quality and efficiency of the system. (Higher quality by allowing learning to be more effective through a more homogeneously 'high' level of students; greater efficiency by retaining a larger proportion of learners through their programs and providing a more solid grounding should students transfer programs and/or enrol in more advanced offerings.)

In addition to student preparedness, participants held strong views about what the colleges bring to their programs; most perceptions about which can be summarized as the need to be 'current.' As an objective, most participants felt strongly about the need for the colleges to provide faculty, equipment and curricula that are up-to-date. Included in this is the requirement that all college employees (particularly faculty and academic administrators involved directly in program development and management) have sufficient professional development opportunities to be fully current with the 'state-of-the-art' in their respective fields, including the knowledge and ability to assist students to become fully competent in the use and application of new technologies. Similarly, the equipment used in college programs must be current and the curriculum seen as fully relevant to industry needs. (As noted, most participants acknowledged that in some areas limited enrolment and high cost would require a limited number of offerings if quality, and efficiency, are to be maintained.) While some participants referenced the framework provided in the "HRD and the Third Decade" report, others cited additional professional development possibilities. Many suggested that research and curriculum development related to new offerings and alternative modes of delivery has been lacking (and/or uncoordinated) and that, as an objective, new initiatives are required if relevancy is to be maintained and quality enhanced.

A third major goal concerns the need to establish 'system' standards in a number of areas. Many participants couched this need in relation to specific features, while others referenced the lack of system-wide standards as a major weakness of the local autonomy model (as presented in the discussion paper). **It must be explicitly stated that no group of participants suggested that colleges should be differentiated with respect to quality.** While many participants wish to see variations in how programs and courses are delivered, no one viewed the prospect of considerable variations in quality (as some inferred from the local autonomy model) as desirable. As will be noted in relation to the 'features' discussed, participants were divided about how best to achieve this objective of consistency across the system; however, most suggested that some form of consistency is required in three main areas:

(a) Most participants felt that the quality of offerings would benefit from clear and consistent entry requirements. Coupled with system-wide provision of assessment, placement and preparatory offerings, learners and employers would be more confident that colleges shared a similar commitment to quality and that prior education and experience were being similarly evaluated which would find the same minimum level of qualification recognized for all students entering the program.

(b) Similar support was voiced for establishing consistent course and program requirements, including exit requirements, recognized and supported by the colleges, industry, government, and other stakeholders (e.g., professional associations, universities). This would include how programs (and diploma requirements) are defined and what constitutes a 'credit.' This was viewed as of particular importance by those who see the need for transfers by learners; between programs, between colleges or between colleges and universities. In addition, most participants felt strongly that access for many learners will require the flexibility that comes from being able to 'stop out;' i.e., acquiring credits toward a credential over a period of time and conceivably at more than one institution. Such consistency would also address equivalence of offerings be they designated as 'full-time' or 'part-time.' Consistency in program requirements is thus viewed as essential to assuring employers and learners that an equivalent level of quality has been attained.

(c) There was a general sense that processes for evaluating programs on a regular basis would be beneficial. To some this was couched in terms of having (at least some) programs 'accredited;' while others saw this as potentially wasteful of limited resources (including their time and energy). There was, however, agreement that there would be benefits to the system from having employers, students and the public-at-large able to view the quality and comparability of college programs (and graduates) with confidence. Participants differed greatly concerning who should be responsible for such reviews, how they should be conducted and how they should be used. Participants did note, however, that program evaluations should be distinct from operational reviews and involve a variety of criteria. The development of any program review process must be distinguished from notions of 'standardizing' program elements. As will be noted below, most participants favoured processes that would allow, perhaps even encourage, diversity in curriculum and especially in delivery. This would require a focus on differences as variations in approach, not necessarily in quality.

To summarize, participants were generally agreed on goals related to quality which provide for (1) a broader notion of education (including general education and possibly core curricula and generic skills, subject to further definition); (2) improvements in the 'critical mass' including (a) better student preparedness (through front-end academic services) and (b) up-to-date college resources (including HRD for college employees, updated equipment and development of relevant curricula and appropriate delivery forms); and (3) system-wide consistency in course and program requirements (including entry and exit standards and mechanisms for program review).

Efficiency (including Funding)

Three major goals were put forward by participants related to the efficiency and funding of college programs. (As noted, some specific suggestions for achieving these are outlined in the Features section, below.)

First, that the system must ensure that funding is adequate to what the colleges are expected to provide. Most participants concluded that previous reductions in general education, the inability to provide adequately for front-end academic services and, possibly, the unevenness of program quality and access, could be traced to inadequate funding. Many suggested, therefore, that costs would have to increase if necessary changes were made in an effort to provide for both higher quality and broader access to college programs; and that this was both necessary and desirable given the role that the system should play in the development of human resources needed to address the pressures of technological and demographic changes. While most felt strongly that limiting access would be against their community's (and the province's) interest, some suggested that the pressures to reduce funding would require colleges to restrict access to the limited number of those most qualified. There was general acceptance of the need for increased funding to meet commitments in the areas of quality (including general education, core and generic skills, curriculum development, HRD, equipment) and access (including alternative delivery and academic services), whether at current or increased levels of enrolment (and possibly even at minimally reduced levels of enrolment). Most participants suggest that funding levels must provide explicitly for these required activities.

A second goal concerns the need to provide for greater stability and coordination of funding. Many participants referenced specific elements for the funding formula which they felt militated against stability (e.g., slip year provisions, inappropriate weighting factors). However, it was generally assumed that enrolment fluctuations are part and parcel of college programming and that these could be better accommodated by a mechanism that was less enrolment sensitive and would allow for (or encourage) better planning with respect to local needs. A related perception reflected participants' views with respect to the need for coordination. Many pointed out the problems associated with responding to funding changes and the variety of provincial ministries (and the federal government) to which they relate. Though the Grants Commission structure (of the third model) was seen as somewhat confusing, the effective coordination of funding bodies was view by most as a necessary objective.

Included under the general goal of stability and coordination is the more specific objective of adapting a mechanism that will be at least neutral to, if not encouraging of, part-time and adult learners. Many participants perceive the current formula to be biased toward full-time post-secondary students and, as noted above, most accept the likelihood of significant shifts in the colleges' clientele.

In the absence of greater stability and coordination, many participants suggested that the colleges need to diversify their sources of revenue to include less reliance on traditional government sources and increased revenue from continuing education, contract training and other fees, given the opportunity. Related to this was the widespread perception that employers must become increasingly involved in the funding of additional training for their employees, either directly through contract training, or indirectly through a mechanism such as the 'grant-levy' scheme (which most participants viewed favourably, in principle, subject to much further elaboration).

A related objective concerning funding was voiced as the need to provide for some separation of funding from enrolment. Whether in the form of providing 'core' funding for certain activities (as suggested by some participants from colleges in the northern part of the province) or other means, many participants expressed the need to provide varying kinds of services to their communities irrespective of specific program enrolments. Variations in enrolments are perceived to simply provide instability in funding such activities as 'brokering' services, community development, consulting with local industries, assisting community groups, etc. (An interesting version of this problem was one group's view that the current arrangements 'reward numbers while opting for quality.') It was assumed, for example, that centres of specialization/excellence would have to be funded on a different basis. While the adequacy of funding is one factor, the flexibility most participants spoke of requires, in their view, recognition that some activities are neither determined nor measurable simply by enrolments.

A third major goal is that of efficiency in how courses and programs are delivered. Three major sources of possible efficiencies were advocated. First, most view increasing their retention of learners from first to subsequent years as a major gain, especially when considered as cost per graduate rather than cost per student. While many factors were offered which may contribute to attrition, most suggested that remediation coupled with flexibility to allow credit accumulation for part-time study and transfers would be of some benefit. Second, most participants accept that some savings can be generated through the consolidation of selected programs (particularly those with high costs and/or low enrolments). Third, participants generally favour the investigation of alternative delivery forms, not only to benefit access and quality, but efficiency as well. It should be noted that most participants strongly espoused the view that the quality of and access to college programs should not be sacrificed to efficiency measures. (As noted, a small minority believe that it would be necessary and responsible to reduce access in an effort to accommodate reduced funding levels.)

While some specific features will be discussed below, it may be useful to summarize the three major objectives related to funding and efficiency: (1) ensuring adequate funding (including explicit funding for activities required to meet quality and access objectives); (2) providing greater stability and coordination of funding (including reducing the relationship between enrolment and funding, coordinating government funding sources and adjustments to encourage part-time enrolments); and (3) measures to increase efficiency (especially by increasing retention and consolidating selected offerings).

Structure, Organization and Governance (and Decision-Making)

The perceptions of participants in this area are more difficult to summarize than in the other areas for a number of, perhaps obvious, reasons. First, the different models offered in the discussion paper were indeed provocative and (by way of self-criticism) somewhat confusing to at least some participants. Second, a number of participants (and groups) referenced concerns and questions which were admittedly difficult, such as "it depends on who is on it" (i.e., on a particular body, whether representation or personalities) or "it depends on what authority it has," and which called for participants to answer their own concerns (indeed "who should be on it?" and "what authority should it have?"). Third, the process of the focus groups did not require the development of a fully elaborated alternative (model 4 or model X); but, rather, participants were allowed, indeed encouraged, to 'mix and match' elements and ideas into what they felt would be most desirable, rather than a fully developed organization. Finally, the reporting process (the group as a whole) made it difficult to find minority views; either reports were limited only to those elements all agreed to, or ideas were presented as the generalization that garnered consensus, with groups having insufficient time to arrive at more detail.

Given these qualifications, four major goals or principles appear to represent a majority of participants' views of what is desirable.

First, participants clearly expressed a preference for a system which would be organized to retain twenty-three colleges each having a considerable degree of autonomy. This view, however, is contingent on the assumption (or desire) that significant differences would not exist between colleges in areas which would effect quality, access or efficiency; including the provision of general education, academic (and other student) services, entry or exit standards, program requirements (including course and/or program hours), access to equipment or other resources — all of which participants believe ought to be comparable across the system. A majority of participants feel strongly that those closest to their communities must have the authority to provide the appropriate offerings in the appropriate forms. Considerable apprehension (and some antipathy) is expressed to the notion that any central body might dictate to local colleges and their communities.

Participants similarly expressed a strong preference for a second goal; namely a central coordinating role in a number of areas. (It cannot be over-emphasized that participants viewed these as complementary, not contradictory, principles.) The areas where a central role was advocated include:

(a) academic (policy) changes; including general education and possibly core and generic skills guidelines, assessment of prior education and experience, entry standards, the provision of preparatory programs, curriculum development, professional and human resource development, and guidelines for program review. In particular, participants felt strongly that the need for 'transferability' within and between colleges, as well as between colleges and universities, requires a system-wide presence. In short, areas where quality and access might differ considerably if coordination were absent, or where individual colleges could not be reasonably expected to assume the full cost;

(b) specialized programming, including new initiatives in higher level training (be they in the form of polytechnic or post-diploma programs, centres of specialization, etc.) or programs that need to be consolidated owing to enrolment and/or cost pressures;

(c) determining a framework for providing equivalencies to facilitate access for part-time (especially adult) learners, including transfers between programs, colleges and universities;

(d) relationships between the colleges, collectively, and other stakeholders, including employer and industry associations, unions, professional associations, etc.; particularly as it concerns the certification of graduates and/or accreditation of programs;

(e) funding, both with regard to the levels of funding and the coordinating of funders;

(f) collective bargaining; and

(g) coordinating the image, perception and marketing of the college system as a whole, including to the secondary schools, universities, and the public-at-large; acting as an advocate for the system and its values.

As noted, while participants expressed the need for a coordinated approach in these areas, there was far less agreement about what form such an approach might take. It should be noted that, with the exception of more specialized offerings, there was no clear view of which principle should guide the important area of program allocation decisions (including program approval and program termination). It is necessary to report, rather, that participants were divided (in both their desires and their perceptions of the models presented) with some suggesting that a more central system would be unresponsive (and preclude individual colleges from being responsive), reduce access and reduce the colleges' ability to offer unique programs. Others viewed a central role as necessary to provide a check against locally determined program cuts (possibly leading to a narrowing of the college's focus), significant variations in quality (including the current state of some considerable variations in program hours for otherwise 'equivalent' programs) and the potential for 'contracting out' educational services. These differences, indeed, may not be reconcilable. If, however, an attempt to synthesize such views is to be made, it will be necessary to answer the question of "what kind of coordination would be most effective for each area?" (The study team may wish further clarification of this issue.)

The third general principle expressed by most participants is that of cooperation and coordination, rather than competition. This must be understood to apply not only to relations among the colleges, but to relations between colleges and other providers as well. With respect to the former, while a minority viewed competition for students and funding to be a positive element, most felt such competition was inefficient, if not wasteful. Most participants assumed that the future health of the colleges would require increased levels of cooperation. With respect to relationships between colleges and other providers, most felt that the colleges ought not be competing directly with other public providers of education, including school boards, universities and not-for-profit community-based groups given a common interest in meeting public needs. Many groups of participants expressed their strong desire for a clear statement with respect to what will (or should) differentiate the colleges' role from that of other providers (which some referred to as 'positioning'). To some the need for such clarification comes from the experience of competition with other providers; to others, from the experience of duplicated efforts.

It should be noted that much concern was expressed regarding the role of private trainers. Apart from questioning specific aspects of such training (such as the breadth, quality and cost), many participants urged the adoption of the principle that 'public funding should go to public institutions." While some felt that their colleges can and do compete well with private trainers, most perceive such comparisons as inherently unfair. A major factor in this view is that colleges are — or should be — providing a broader education and that cost, in itself (i.e., without examining quality or scope of offerings) is an unfair basis for comparison and, more importantly, the allocation of public funds. A minority view held that public funds might better be channelled 'through' public institutions (such as the colleges) which could play a 'quality control' function for activities not under their direct control.

A fourth broad goal concerns decision-making processes. In discussing the models offered as well as their own preferences with respect to the structure of the system, many participants referenced the need to consider the processes by which decisions in a variety of areas would be made. As noted above, the goals of local responsibility and central coordination were perceived as complimentary, not contradictory. Participants were generally agreed that, whether local or more central, decisions ought to be made with the involvement of a variety of stakeholders. While there was less agreement on how such participation might be built into governing structures, there was widespread commitment to the principle that those closest to the process should have a greater role in decision-making. For some, this would find faculty and academic administrators having major responsibility; others included employers and students as well.

Most participants also wished to apply this principle to areas of central coordination and/or decision-making. Many participants fear that the further removed decisions are from the colleges, particularly 'academic' policy decisions, the greater the likelihood of their being 'politicized.' In an effort to limit such possibilities, as well as to counter the extremely negative perceptions of bureaucratic decision-making, many participants suggested that structures mandated with a coordinating function should have representation drawn from local colleges, including administrators, faculty, staff and, possibly, students. (Some went so far as to suggest that all bodies, be they locally, regionally or centrally oriented, should be democratically constituted; i.e., with members elected by their respective constituencies.)

The principle of participation in coordinating bodies was also explicitly mentioned with respect to the involvement of those external to the colleges; particularly the need for employers, industry and professional associations, unions, academics, ministry staff, and other providers of education and training to provide input into a variety of policy and other decisions. It appeared that participants generally agreed, however, that such groups should have an advisory role, rather than any direct decision-making authority. In general, the position of many participants (most groups which appeared to discuss the matter) was that the colleges and the college system should be essentially 'self-governing' in both local and more central decision-making, though with the expressed involvement of a variety of others. (An important exception to this was the acknowledgement that the determination of levels of funding remains clearly with government, though their allocations might involve considerably more input from a variety of stakeholders.)

An additional objective was cited with respect to the processes of Vision 2000 and its aftermath; namely, that recommendations should consider the potential effects of proposed changes. Many participants expressed the view that the system is basically 'sound.' Some felt that more major changes would likely create significant negative (even if shorter-term) effects on the motivation and morale of many within the college community, particularly college employees. This perception appeared to be limited to structure and governance issues. While most agreed that possible changes related to access and quality would be major, no concern was expressed that this should preclude their recommendation or implementation. Representatives of Vision 2000 were often explicitly asked to report that many participants felt that, in calculating the 'transition costs' of any changes, consideration must also be given to the non-monetary costs of any changes.

While some particular features will be outlined below, four major goals (or principles) can be summarized with respect to structure, organization and governance of the colleges: (1) that the system be organized to retain largely autonomous colleges; (2) that system-wide coordination is necessary in a number of areas (including academic policy and initiatives, funding, and collective bargaining); (3) that the colleges embody the value of cooperation, rather than competition (both among colleges and between colleges and other providers, including a clear delineation of the appropriate role of private trainers); and (4) that decision-making structures at all levels assure appropriate participation of stakeholders and processes be developed to allow the system to be essentially self-governing. Additionally, that Vision 2000 should consider the non-monetary costs of changes and recommend those that achieve desirable goals with the least disruption.

A Final Note on Objectives

Some participants in the focus groups and/or readers of this summary of the discussions might be tempted to suggest that great deal of time and effort has been expended to confirm the obvious. It is perhaps important to note that the discussions could, in fact, have produced quite different results which many might have viewed as less obvious, if not more problematic.

Participants could have suggested that access ought not be a major goal of the colleges; that a more 'elitist,' rather than 'open,' system, is appropriate or desirable; that assessment and preparatory programs are unnecessary; that the colleges should be highly specialized and differentiated, rather than essentially comprehensive; or that learners should be fitted to standardized delivery, rather than having courses offered in a variety of flexible and responsive modes.

Participants could have suggested that the colleges define quality in terms of a narrower, rather than a broader, view of education and training (i.e., that general education, for example, is not an important need); that the level of training needed in the year 2000 will not require concerted efforts in the areas of human resource and curriculum development; that consistent course and program requirements and review are unnecessary or even detrimental.

A far different perspective would have emerged from such views of access and quality. Similarly, with respect to efficiency (and funding) as well as structure and governance. Respondents might have suggested current funding was adequate and new initiatives unnecessary (that a 'leaner and meaner' system was consistent with their values); that short-term cost reductions are more important than adopting a longer-term perspective (which suggests the cost-effectiveness of a broader education and lifelong learning). Participants might have suggested that the colleges should be fully autonomous, that differences in access, quality, student services, program content and offerings would be legitimate (or even useful); or that experts at Queen's Park ought to make decisions, including operational decisions about offerings and course content; or that it would be a waste of time to participate in college and/or system decision-making.

The fact that participants gave voice to the goals and objectives, the values and principles they advocated is probably less a function of who participated in the discussion groups than of what understandings are indeed generally shared about the colleges and how best to serve their communities in the future.

While the above summary of participants major goals may serve to guide the study team's discussions, it may be useful to offer some of the features suggested by participants as possible means to achieve some of these objectives.

Some Possible Features

This section of the summary of responses will outline a variety of features offered by participants in the various focus groups. For the most part, these will be cited with little comment other than an indication of the objective(s) to which they refer and the differences expressed by participants. Where suggested elements are less clear, some questions for the study team will be offered. As noted in the introduction, most groups offered a variety of suggestions, rather than a 'model' of any kind. Some suggestions were specific; others more general and some simply called for further consideration by the study team. These are organized under the same main headings, though some serve objectives in more than one area.

Access

1. In order to address the principle of defining access as the opportunity to succeed, not merely to enrol, and the objective of open access (as well as the 'quality' objectives related to the preparedness of learners) each college should provide for the assessment of learners (including prior education and experience), for career and academic counselling and for adequate preparatory and remedial opportunities. Most participants felt that these should be provided under system-wide guidelines to ensure equivalent treatment of learners, possibly using 'tools' developed on a system-wide basis. Such activities should be explicitly funded at a level not less than that afforded other post-secondary activity. Many participants suggested that colleges need authority to determine how such services are provided. In particular, suggestions for remedial activities included individual and peer tutoring, separate courses and an 'interim semester' approach. Some participants suggested the need for a system-wide group to monitor the provision

of such services. In general, participants were divided about whether the quality or equivalence of the range of academic services could be maintained across colleges if these functions were left to individual institutions to develop and implement.

2. To address the objective of colleges being comprehensive, many participants wanted colleges to offer core programs in all fields, with program consolidation/specializations limited to those programs and/or courses with limited enrolment and/or high costs. A number of participants, particularly from Eastern and Northern regions, suggested that, in those cases where programs cannot be offered locally, consideration be given to a 'regional' distribution to facilitate access. Central region participants expressed the view that additional consolidation might be feasible in Metro, but stopped short of advocating a regional approach to program distribution even there. As well, most participants would like to see mobility allowances (possibly special grants or loans), increased use of residences and, especially, alternative delivery modes to help provide more equal access. Participants were generally opposed to 'splitting' programs by having the initial year(s) of a program offered locally and subsequent year(s) offered elsewhere. Most saw this as likely leading to diminished access, particularly at smaller colleges.

A number of participants offered the view that one aspect of their service to their communities which is an important function of their colleges (mainly in the north) is their role in 'brokering' educational services; that is, in facilitating access for individuals to courses offered by other providers; a function they feel important to retain.

As noted, there were divergent views about where program approval decisions should be located between those who most strongly advocated local autonomy and those who suggested that local colleges might reduce offerings, particularly higher cost offerings, thereby limiting access, too severely in the absence of system-wide checks. This latter view, however, did not suggest that a provincial body have 'control' over program allocations, though how strong an 'advisory' role was needed was left undefined. Some suggested that regional committees might play such a role. Most participants clearly believe that regional or provincial bodies should have a planning and coordinating (rather than a governing) role, with the question of how disagreements or differences might be addressed left unresolved. Participants generally assumed that programs of more specialized and advanced training would need to be determined by a system-wide body and were divided about the importance and practicality of regional centres.

3. The objective of flexibility (as part of assisting access) might be aided by a number of concrete suggestions. A majority of participants strongly favoured the use of 'credits,' rather than 'programs,' with clear guidelines as to what will comprise different types of programs and certification. This was seen as necessary to facilitate transfers (of all types) and as a tangible encouragement to the notion of 'lifelong learning,' allowing learners to build on prior learning and experience. A system-wide 'learner registry' was suggested to facilitate transfers and coordinate registrations. (It is noteworthy that, while most saw the idea of standardizing 'credits' as beneficial to access and transfers, there was little discussion of transfer to university programs, other than that it was important to provide for, but should not be a dominant orientation of the system.) Additionally, some suggestion was made that standard credits or hours should be used to determine program length; i.e., that programs and courses should be recognizably equivalent (both within and between colleges) if transfers, stopping out, etc. were to be facilitated. (This was clearly viewed as distinct from standardizing content or mode of delivery.)

Most participants strongly suggest that access for adult learners, and in particular those with employment and/or family commitments, would be aided by more flexibility in delivery; including modes such as computer-based education, distance education, independent (or guided) study, and by scheduling to allow for enrolment in day, twilight, evening, weekend, etc. courses. Most put forward the view that learners and employers needed to be reassured that different forms would be equivalent in content and exposure, whether as a college or system responsibility.

The idea of learners 'building' toward credentials in a variety of ways led some to suggest the benefits of a 'provincial' diploma either in addition to or instead of college diplomas. Some suggested a diploma in a general field, with a 'major,' would aid access and flexibility and was the natural extension of the need for learners to have flexibility in building their programs.

The issues of whether to develop the idea of a 'provincial' diploma and how to assure equivalencies in the provision of programs and academic services related to quality, efficiency and governance as well as to access, need further discussion by the study team.

Quality

1. Several suggestions were offered regarding how best to achieve the objective of broadening the scope of what constitutes a college education. First, most participants agreed that general education ought to be mandated to comprise a definite proportion of post-secondary programs, with suggestions ranging from one-quarter to one-third. Some fear was expressed that the integration of greater amounts of general education into existing offerings would more likely result in an erosion of general education content than if organized as discrete courses. Second, most participants considered some type of core curriculum and/or generic skills to be valuable. However, as there were few details offered, it is difficult to conclude what kind of broadening might be involved. Some referred to the distinction between knowledge, skills and abilities; with general education being seen as contributing basic knowledge, generic skills dealing with communications and problem solving abilities as well as an appreciation of the breadth of different fields, and a core curriculum connoting competencies required by all occupations within a given field. Many participants suggested the need for elaborating on these concepts. Participants differed on how specific directives and/or guidelines in these areas should be, though there was general agreement that some form of system-wide guidelines would be desirable. It should also be noted that it was not clear how any of these provisions might be related to non-post-secondary activity. One suggestion consistent with the objective of providing for transfer and different levels or types of credentials, was to establish some requirements in these areas for all programs (including certificates for adult training), with additional requirements for post-secondary diplomas (equivalent to current two-year and three-year programs).

2. Suggestions for meeting the objectives of what colleges provide included agreement on system-wide initiatives in curriculum development and alternative modes of delivery, including the provision of central funding to create resources to be used by the system as a whole. Some participants characterized these initiatives as 'the system's R&D;' encouraging the development of new 'products and services,' and of more effective means of providing a quality product to meet diverse needs. While system-wide responsibilities, participants consistently suggested the need for 'college people' to engage in such developmental activities. There was division concerning whether, in addition to providing funding, some central body should be responsible for determining which activities to pursue. Additionally, central funding was seen as necessary to update equipment. Some suggestions were made about the sharing of facilities and equipment to maintain 'relevancy,' particularly wider use of work experience and co-op programs where learners can be exposed directly to current industry equipment and practices. (Features related to what students bring to programs are outlined above.)

The importance of human resource development for college employees to the quality of offerings was referenced in nearly all groups. Most preferred to see programs locally developed, though funded centrally. All saw the need for greater exposure to current business and industry practices, with some suggesting that faculty be routinely granted time to update themselves (e.g., one semester every three or five years). Some participants noted the considerable expense of providing such experiences, but suggested that updating might be coupled with specific curriculum development projects or, alternatively, that exchanges be established with specific firms. (One participant suggested that this might ultimately lead to a 'zero-cost' possibility if, and only if, people from industry who were competent teachers could be found for such exchanges; most likely on a course by course basis.) This was also seen by some as a possible vehicle for greater employer involvement in college programming.

3. In achieving the objective of providing system-wide standards and/or guidelines, there was little consensus on the level of detail and how directive such standards or guidelines, should be. Consistent with the provision of academic services (noted under 'access' above), most participants cited the need for common

entry standards (a 'rigourous grade 12'), contingent on those services being provided. There were considerable differences over how much latitude local colleges (and individual programs) should have over admissions and still be able to provide open, and equal, access. (It was noted that universities differ in their admission standards and yet maintain the ability for learners to transfer and for graduates credentials to be viewed as largely similar (even accounting for preferences among universities). This was seen, by some to conflict with the principle of access, given that universities make little, if any claim to meeting 'local' needs.) Some participants suggested that colleges should control admissions as a means of raising standards.

Differences were also evident with respect to how particular elements aimed at meeting the objective of consistent course requirements should be determined and how specific these ought to be. As noted, most participants see the need for some guidelines, with specific content, delivery and evaluation determined locally. It was suggested that a provincial presence, if more directive, would serve to undermine quality by undermining motivation, morale and individual initiative. A minority, however, suggested that consistency required a greater system-wide focus as well as the involvement of some groups external to the colleges who have legitimate interest in, and useful input for, enhancing program quality. Similar differences in perspective can be seen from those groups which discussed program review and accreditation; with a majority suggesting that system-wide guidelines must allow for individual differences in content and delivery not to be seen as necessarily representing differences in quality; that more specific proposals would unnecessarily encroach on useful college, program or course differences, without adding to quality; and that 'guidelines' which mandated (and funded) regular program reviews (distinct from operational reviews) were sufficient. Proposals for regular 'external' appraisal of programs were offered by a minority of participants who viewed the systems' credibility and consistency as benefiting from such a process.

Much of these discussions used the suggestion of 'program councils' (from Model 3 of the Discussion Paper) as a starting point and the study team may be advised to consider both the majority and minority sentiments in relation to the objectives both groups appeared to endorse; namely, the desire to pursue an equivalent (and high) level of quality in similar programs across the system, and the consensus that any such bodies have representation, if not be controlled by, college academic personnel, from across the system (rather than be dominated by either Metro colleges or by a bureaucracy). The appropriate roles with respect to program development, approval, content, delivery, and funding would, for a majority of participants, have to conform to the principles of 'central coordination/local control' and 'central guidelines/local variations' in order to be consistent with the notion that local identity, ownership and commitment are major factors contributing to enhanced quality.

Efficiency and Funding

Funding:

1. In order to meet the objective of defining access as the opportunity to succeed and providing for 'open' access, as well as providing for the quality objectives related to the improvement of entry standards and the adequate preparation of learners for their programs:

   (a) explicit funding should be provided for assessment, academic counselling (including program placement), and preparatory and remedial activities. A majority of participants indicated their desire to see such funding calculated as an explicit category in any formula and funded at a level no less than that afforded other post-secondary activity;

   (b) explicit funding should be provided for assessment activities including the development of a common system for the granting of credit for prior learning and experience;

   (c) explicit funding should be provided for remediation activities during the course of a learners program. (The 'interim semester' idea at Seneca was often referred to, though many participants thought that under a system where greater numbers were attending part-time, some remedial activity would take the form of individual courses, which would not receive credit, but which would be explicitly funded).

2. In order to address the objective of providing for greater access for part-time learners, the formula should provide incentives, including greater funding for part-time enrolments (a specific suggestion for which was the reduction in FTE equivalent hours from 1060 to 840 for all programs). The feature offered in the discussion paper (funding on a credit basis, rather than FTEs by program) received widespread support, assuming that, coupled with a system for learners to accumulate credits towards a college credential, it would encourage colleges to accept part-time students and develop part-time offerings. Increases in the level of OSAP available to part-time (and employed) learners was also suggested.

3. In order to address the objective of expanded general education content in all programs, there was general acceptance of the notion that the (re)introduction of general education would create additional cost to the system, most particularly through the lengthening of most programs. It was noted by some participants, however, that this might coincide with more efficient delivery of generic and specific skills in some programs and/or be accomplished by integrating general education content in more 'regular program offerings.' (There was little consensus as to how feasible the latter proposal would be given the pressures of time and content already felt by many faculty and administrators.)

4. In order to achieve the objectives related to quality identified in terms of the resources the college provide, the vast majority of participants saw the need for (a) explicit funding for human resource development for college personnel; (b) explicit funding for curriculum development initiatives (including, but not limited to, the development of 'core courses' and offerings aimed at developing 'generic skills;' and (c) the development of a variety of alternative delivery forms (which also might contribute to access objectives). While there was little detail as to the amounts needed for such initiatives, it was assumed that these were longer term commitments.

5. In order to meet the objective of coordinating the variety of funding sources at a system level, two distinct alternatives were put forward:

a) consolidating all funding for education and training at the post-secondary level in a single ministry (recombining MCU and MSD), with some sentiment for a more thorough consolidation of educational funding under a single ministry which would include primary and secondary education, and parts of the Labour, Social Services, Health, and Culture and Recreation (ministries providing support for either programs or individuals enrolled in programs); or

b) establishing a single body, similar to the Grants Commission identified in Model 3, which would coordinate funding to the colleges, and perhaps other educational providers, while maintaining the basic structure of independent ministries. Such a body might benefit from including representation of CEIC, as well as several provincial ministries. While there was little discussion of the issue, some participants noted that this might seem to limit the 'autonomy' of CEIC in dealing with the colleges, and there was no agreement as to whether this would be either acceptable or practical.

6. Regarding the objective of greater stability of funding, a number of groups suggested that the formula be made less enrolment sensitive. (It was frequently noted that the preoccupation with enrolment has been an impediment to the further development of quality.) Other specific suggestions included the idea of establishing 'corridors' of enrolment (as one means of making the formula less sensitive) and eliminating the slip year provision. In addition, the suggestion was made that 'core' funding be investigated for a range of basic services that colleges provide, irrespective of numbers.

7. As a means of addressing the need for some efficiencies in the delivery of more expensive programs, especially those requiring greater capital resources, most agreed with the consolidation of such programs at a few locations. Others suggested, however, that alternative delivery forms (e.g., using 'itinerant' instructors, developing special work experience and co-op programs for use of employers equipment) would better address this problem, without the loss in access that might result from program consolidation.

It should be noted that many participants perceived that the largest efficiencies can be realized by increasing retention of students into 'upper level' courses. Most believe that the provision of front-end academic services (leading to more homogeneous entry levels), coupled with opportunities for remediation, will achieve a reduction in academically related attrition, leading to more optimal class sizes and lower costs per graduate, while increasing the quality and effectiveness of many offerings.

8. In order to maintain access to more specialized programs, most participants saw the need for special allowances for students to move, increases in OSAP and, in selective cases, further provision of residences.

9. There was widespread interest in the idea of a 'grant-levy' system for the funding of upgrading and adult training activities in the province. While most felt that additional details were needed, a number of participants expressed concern as to the complexity of administering such a system, either locally or centrally, and the need to have such activities coordinated with other program offerings. Most everyone agreed that, ideally, it would enable a far greater level of training activity and would be beneficial in the development of more extensive relations between colleges and employers, as well as increasing the access of large numbers of employees to increased levels of training which would benefit the provincial economy; in particular, during periods of transition.

Structure, Organization, Governance and Decision-Making

Several of the features suggested by participants with respect to structure have been cited above. It may be useful here to reiterate the most important features and questions identified by participants.

As noted, participants generally supported the need for decisions to be vested in local colleges (notwithstanding those areas requiring coordination). To the extent that local colleges are to exercise control over academic matters, a number of participants suggested that academic councils be constituted at each college with representation from college constituencies. Some suggested that faculty be in a majority on such bodies and be democratically elected. There was agreement that Boards of Governors should retain ultimate control under such a local system, though many suggested the need for greater representation of college constituencies, with full voting rights, on college boards. A well, several participants advocated the concept of local boards being elected, though others opposed this, offering the view that planning and decision-making would be limited by the short-term horizons of the next election. While participants generally concurred on the need to have decision-making be less susceptible to political pressure, it was unclear what features would achieve this.

The clear indication that college activities would benefit from some degree(s) of coordination represents an important objective limiting institutional autonomy. While many suggested that autonomy, in the current system, has been limited, the responses to the models offered a number of suggestions for areas where system-wide initiatives might be productive. As noted above, it is difficult to see how far such initiatives might proceed before they are likely to have a negative impact on local autonomy. As well, it is unclear which areas and potential processes for decision-making might justifiably limit local autonomy (i.e., by providing effective means to meet agreed upon objectives).

In two major areas, academic policy and funding, participants clearly subscribed to the potential benefits of coordination. With respect to academic bodies, the main differences do not concern goals, but rather whether such entities should exist to provide advice and facilitate cooperation between otherwise autonomous institutions or be vested with some decision-making authority. This distinction would apply, for example, to the desire to see the colleges as a whole, and each college with respect to its communities, 'positioned' with regard to how its offerings relate to those of other providers. Participants generally viewed the idea of an 'educational authority' (described briefly in the appendix to model 2 of the discussion paper) as a potentially useful body to assist in articulation with secondary schools, coordination with universities and with other providers. Most, however, were clear that it should not be given authority to determine what programs should or shouldn't be offered by any institution, nor should any institution be compelled to participate, by any provision that would have such bodies allocate funds.

A similar dilemma concerns the coordination of academic policy within the system. With respect to the initiatives identified, some participants clearly view the Ministry (MCU) as the appropriate body to issue guidelines and directives and provide funding to implement these. Others, however, see the establishment of a system-wide body as more appropriate, with representation from a variety of stakeholders (both internal and external to the colleges). Again, the distinction is whether such entities should exist to provide advice to colleges (or the ministry) or should it/they be vested with some authority. Participants were divided on this matter. Many of those who suggested that system-wide bodies be comprised of, or controlled by, college personnel appeared more inclined to suggest some measure of authority would be appropriate (possibly with an appeal mechanism). Others assume that such bodies would be dominated by members external to the colleges, especially by an additional level of bureaucracy, and would limit their role to advice and consultation. The study team may wish to reconcile such differences.

It should be noted that there was very limited support for most aspects of the regional college model. Several groups, however, did suggest features or drew inferences that they supported. Specifically, most felt that the loss of identity, larger and more distant college administration, and loss of local programming in many areas as serious weaknesses. Features viewed more favourably included regional access to programs unavailable locally, cooperation between colleges/campuses to save 'marginal' programs, and transferability between campuses/colleges. Such features were desired in other forms, as noted above. One important exception to this were the strong feelings of many Francophone participants that a regional organization is both feasible and necessary to facilitate access for their communities. The view was offered that each region of the province required, and could productively and effectively provide for demonstrable needs through, regional Francophone colleges.

Finally, it must be noted that participants generally supported a continuation of centralized bargaining. A variety of reasons were offered including the disruptive effects of any change and the potential benefit of an ability for faculty and staff to transfer (similar to the value of facilitating student transfers). There was some discussion of the negative effects and inefficiencies of local bargaining. However, there were numerous suggestions that provisions be retained (or expanded) for local agreements, particularly in the area of workload, within centrally negotiated parameters.

Some Additional Questions

There was little doubt that a majority of participants feel strongly that their college, and the system as a whole, will be required to be, if not all things to all people, at least 'most things to more people.' The principles and goals summarized above provide a framework around which most participants would wish to see the system develop. While some specific elements have been suggested, the often animated interchanges which characterized many of the individual focus groups provoked a number of questions triggered by the discussion paper which the study team may wish to explicitly consider (some of which have been cited above), many of which cut across the main topics discussed.

1. Assuming the funding is adequate to meet the objectives of broadening college programs, will this result in a lengthening of programs such that enrolment (especially by secondary school graduates) is, in practice, discouraged? Would such lengthening require additional, more advanced training (which might be less accessible) before a student was considered 'employable?' Does this compromise the objectives of being comprehensible and of not splitting programs?

2. What will constitute an appropriate broadening, for quality, in Adult Training offerings and how can these e most effectively organized? Participants overwhelmingly endorsed the principle, but had much greater difficulty in applying it to non-post-secondary programs. How extensive will changes in attitudes (of funding bodies, employers and potential learners) have to be in order to bring this about? How can we further these attitudinal changes (assuming we want/need to)?

3. Assuming a coordinating function is to be attempted, how (organizationally and/or jurisdictionally) can this be reconciled with local decision-making? with participatory decision-making? (This seems particularly important in the area of program approval.)

Specific questions include:

a) What areas of academic policy and decision-making, if any ought to be coordinated system-wide?

b) What structure(s) will best provide such coordination, taking into account the distinction between advice and authority? Would this differ for different policy/decision-making areas?

c) What should the relationship of major stakeholders (both internal and external) be to any new structure and processes?

d) What specific functions will any new structure(s) have and how might these be exercised?

e) If appropriate structure and process(es) are defined, how might these be implemented and by whom?

4. How can the system balance shorter and longer term employment needs? This is of some importance given the general disillusionment with manpower planning attempts at an aggregate level and the perception that many local employers are unable to plan beyond their most immediate needs.

5. Can (and should) offerings be organized differently in Metro than in other areas? Would this involve two different (and possibly unequal) systems? How can the impression that the system is Metro-dominated be addressed? What decision-making structures and processes will be most effective in providing for the genuine involvement of personnel from across the system?

6. What form(s) of accountability are most appropriate? (While some participants mentioned 'accountability,' there was little discussion of what it would involve in practice. For example, ministry officials cite 'ministerial accountability;' taxpayers expect that boards of governors will be 'accountable;' they, in turn, hold senior administrators 'accountable.' What form does accountability take in a system that is 'self-governing?' Can any of these be usefully developed? What is the relationship between quality control/assurance and accountability?

A Final Note

This has probably been a more lengthy reporting of responses to the discussion paper than either the study team or staff anticipated. The responses were difficult to categorize, let alone synthesize. Hopefully, the development of a limited number of objectives or principles has not inappropriately abstracted from the actual discussions which took place in more than two dozen individual groups which included over three hundred participants. For the summary to be seen as 'accurate' would require participants to find their views acknowledged, whether or not they were concluded to be the predominant view. In the absence of that check, it is hoped that the study team will find the summary to have reported on the major issues they sought to address and for which the discussion paper was written: quality, access, efficiency and college-government relations. Hopefully, the paper and the responses to it have helped to provide meaningful and substantive input from members of the college system on these issues which might help the study team and steering committee develop their recommendations. If this goal has been furthered, it will have been worth the considerable efforts of all those who have contributed.

Challenges to the College and the College System

Background Papers

Harv Honsberger
Sheridan College

Themes and Implications: A Report on the Visions from the College System

Study Team 4

Themes and Implications: A Report on the Visions from the College System

Summary

Vision 2000's Study Team 4 invited the college community to envision the college of the future. The project, named "Imagine your College," was designed to solicit ideas on the college system's need to review and renew its mandate. This paper reports on 'what' the system had to say, as well as a general look at 'who said it.' In addition, implications for the system are examined.

Over two hundred 'visions' were received by Study Team 4, involving several thousand people within the system. There was strong participation by faculty, management, advisory committees and boards, and academic/college councils or special committees assigned to develop Vision 2000 responses. Submissions were also received from regional and provincial committees, students and alumni, community, business and professional groups, support staff, school boards, universities, and other government ministries.

Most 'visions' were in written form, with the exception of several videotaped submissions. The written visions were presented in a variety of formats including conference proceedings, workshop reports, lecture texts, newspaper articles, reports, letters, tables, graphs, illustrations, curriculum outlines, and research findings.

Three major categories of themes emerged from the 'visions': colleges and the college system mandate; learning processes; and colleges and college system governance.

The visions, and a preliminary version of this report, were used by Study Team 4 in two ways. First, the visions helped identify the key themes and issues which needed to be addressed in the review of the mandate. In this way, the 'visions' were used to establish the research agenda for Study Team 4 as it explored issues of quality, access and efficiency. The 'visions' also helped inform the development of recommendations on changes and improvements to the mandate of the colleges. (See Challenges to the College and the College System. Study Team 4 Final Report.)

These visions have helped guide the Study Team, the Vision 2000 Steering Committee and the college system toward the year 2000.

Sommaire

Le groupe d'étude 4 de Vision 2000 a invité les collèges communautaires à se représenter le collège de l'avenir. Le projet intitulé «Imaginez votre collège» a été conçu dans le but de recueillir des opinions sur la nécessité pour le réseau des collèges d'examiner et de renouveler son mandat. Le présent document expose «ce que» le réseau avait à dire et considère brièvement «qui l'a dit». Les répercussions pour le réseau y sont également examinées.

Le groupe d'étude 4 a reçu plus de 200 réponses, représentant plusieurs milliers de personnes au sein du réseau. On comptait une forte participation du corps professoral, de la direction, des comités et des conseils consultatifs, et de comités spéciaux chargés de répondre à Vision 2000. D'autres présentations émanaient de comités régionaux et provinciaux, d'étudiants et d'anciens élèves, d'organismes communautaires, de représentants de l'industrie et de groupements professionnels, de membres du personnel de soutien, de conseils scolaires, d'universités et d'autres ministères.

Dans la plupart des cas, la «vision de l'avenir» était présentée par écrit, et dans quelques cas, sur bande vidéo. Les auteurs avaient adopté divers modèles de présentation, comme des comptes rendus de conférences, rapports d'atelier, textes de conférences, articles de journaux, rapports, lettres, tableaux, graphiques, illustrations, aperçus de programmes et conclusions d'études.

Il s'en est dégagé trois grands thèmes : les collèges et le mandat du réseau collégial, le processus d'apprentissage et les collèges et la gestion du réseau collégial.

L'exposé de la vision de chacun ainsi qu'une version préliminaire du présent rapport ont servi au groupe d'étude 4 de deux façons. Ils l'ont d'abord aidé à identifier les thèmes et les questions clés à aborder dans l'étude du mandat. C'est à partir de cela qu'on a établi le programme de recherche du groupe d'étude 4 sur les questions de qualité, d'accès et d'efficacité. Les présentations lui ont également servi à mettre au point des recommandations sur les changements et les améliorations à apporter au mandat des collèges. (Voir Défis posés aux collèges et au réseau des collèges. Rapport final du groupe d'étude 4.)

Ces présentations ont guidé le groupe d'étude, le comité directeur de Vision 2000 et le réseau collégial vers l'an 2000.

Table of Contents

Page

Introduction 1

- About the Visions 1

Overview of the Visions — Categories and Themes 2

1. The College and College System Mandate 2
2. Learning Process Issues 3
3. Governance Issues 3

Colleges and the College System Mandate 5

1. Accessibility 5
2. Availability 5
3. Success 7
4. Implications of Visions on Accessibility Theme 8

Learning Process 9

1. Flexibility, Student/Client-Centred Perspective, Adult Learners 9
2. The Adult Learner 9
3. Student-Centred Education 11
4. Client-Centred Education 13
5. Flexibility 14
6. Implications of Flexibility, Student/Client-Centred Education and Adult Education 15

Governance 16

1. Standards 16
2. Participation in Decision-Making and Local Autonomy 18

Conclusions 20

Appendix 1. Visions Submitted

Introduction

Study Team 4's mandate was to examine the issues of quality, access, efficiency and government relations as they relate to college education. As well, the study team was to develop a bridge between the project and the colleges.

The project called "Imagine Your College" was designed to encourage those within the college system to participate in the Vision 2000 process. Study team members organized a tour of the system, and in first half of 1989 they visited all the colleges in the province. At these tours, an instructional document has presented which described the scope of the Vision 2000 project and suggested how people might submit their ideas for consideration. As well, each college selected a Vision 2000 Coordinator whose job was to liaise with the project's research secretariat and assist groups and individuals in developing submissions.

By the end approximately 200 submissions (or visions) had been received by Study Team 4. All visions were catalogued, acknowledged, summarized into a two-page format, and distributed to the appropriate study team.

Basically, the themes in the visions fell into one of three interrelated categories: the colleges' mandate; the learning process; and governance.

Several topics discussed were not so much issues as supported values. Chief amongst these were lifelong learning, retraining and human resource development. Most visions wanted the colleges "to make tangible" the concept of lifelong learning. Related to this was the support for a stronger focus on retraining opportunities. All stakeholder, both inside and outside the college system, stressed the importance and the need for more human resource development opportunities for college personnel.

With respect to the latter, a major task force — Human Resource Development in the Third Decade (HRD3) — has been dedicated to addressing this deficiency. An Interim Steering Committee has been meeting to take action on the task force report. Study Team 4 used the HRD3 Task Force Report and the current action plan of the committee in its analysis of the college system. The ideas and recommendations emerging from the visions were compared with those of the task force and were generally found to be complementary.

In summary, the two most recent system-wide projects — Human Resource Development in the Third Decade and Vision 2000 — have strengthened our understanding of the colleges' needs and are providing direction for future development.

About the Visions

The visions submitted gave all the study team's and the Steering Committee some sense of the colleges' readiness to address challenges. Study Team 4 wanted to have the colleges define the important challenges and to bring forward ideas on how to react.

It is important to consider who responded as well as which issues they considered important. However, readers must keep in mind that visions were invited on a voluntary basis. Some colleges, committees, and individuals were able to or were willing to integrate the production of a vision into their professional or personal lives. Certainly some, due to the normal pressures of the day, were not able or willing to do this. Some people may have lacked enough information to submit a vision. Some topics may not be addressed simply because the people able to discuss them were unable or unwilling to make a presentation.

Some things to keep in mind about how the visions are described

- Although Advisory Committees and Boards of Governors are listed separately, these groups involve students, alumni, staff, business, labour and community representatives

- College and Academic Councils are not all constituted exactly the same but, often, have student and staff representation. In some colleges, these councils divided into sub-committees, and each made their own submission. In other colleges, a collective submission was made by the Council or the Council was used to organize and stimulate interest in Vision 2000 topics but not to prepare or submit visions.
- In some cases, union locals made submissions. These were not included as 'staff' submissions in the charts — although, obviously, the people who authored them are staff — since the authors identified themselves in this manner. Obviously, many 'staff' submissions were influenced by people who participate in union affairs.
- Colleges responded to the invitation to make submissions differently, as the Study Team hoped they would. In some cases, colleges acted in a very collective manner by gathering opinions from many stakeholders and then, drafting submissions to which everyone consulted could agree. Other colleges encouraged (or members interpreted the invitation to mean) that individuals or groups within the college should make their own submissions. Thus, the number of visions from a college would be impacted by the process used.
- Similarly, the process used by the college in submitting visions varied. Some colleges collected together group and individual visions, packaged them (rather than integrated them into one vision), and forwarded them whenever they received them. Other colleges waited until all visions were in to forward them. In hindsight, this process led Vision 2000 staff to treat some visions differently. There are probably some visions which are really part of a larger vision. In some cases, individual visions might have inadvertently been included in larger visions when they should not have been. Particular difficulty was encountered when people wanted their Mini-Scan reactions treated as visions.
- A master list of all visions, including topic/title and who submitted the vision is included in the Appendix 1 of this report. It should be noted that from time to time there is a difference between who submitted the vision and who originated the vision. We have attempted to be sensitive to that discrepancy but we may not have been completely successful.

The breadth, depth and coherence of the visions suggests that the people and the system have the awareness, expertise and willingness to address issues identified by this and other study teams. What is contained in the visions is a very thorough list of challenges, implications, a sense of priorities and, both very specific and general, plans of action to deal with those challenges.

Overview of Visions — Categories and Themes

After analyzing the visions, three major themes emerged:

1. the college and the college system mandate
2. the learning process
3. the college and college system governance

These categories and the themes overlap and are related. An index of the categories and themes and the visions, by number, which spoke to the themes is presented in Appendix 2.

1. The College and the College System Mandate

As part of this issue, authors discussed such topics as:

- making the system and colleges into client-centred/student-centred learning institutions;
- open accessibility;
- colleges as community-centred institutions;

- the nature of the relationship amongst colleges, business, community, school boards and universities;
- the adult learner;
- applied research, institutional research, and educational research;
- the multicultural community;
- English as a Second Language (ESL) training;
- the colleges' role in providing for 'lifelong learning';
- a mandate specifying the provision of generic skills, core curriculum, and general education;
- the need to provide both retraining and entry level career education;
- the growing concern for the environment;
- technology training;
- the full-time and part-time student; and
- apprenticeships.

2. Learning Process Issues

As part of this issue, authors discussed:

- client-based and student-centred curriculum and learning strategies;
- the need for flexibility (in many dimensions) in the learning environment;
- modular curriculum;
- curriculum development reform;
- assessment of students to determine skill/knowledge levels for the purpose of matching students with the appropriate educational opportunity;
- the need for preparatory and remedial services;
- generic skills/core curriculum/general education;
- standards for curriculum, teaching and resources;
- the adult learner;
- alternative delivery strategies and skills;
- lifelong learning;
- human resource development to support the changing mandate; and
- facilities development.

3. Governance Issues

As part of this issue, authors discussed:

- college system governance;
- college governance;
- formal and informal relationships amongst colleges, business, community, schools, and universities;
- transferability;
- credentials;
- credit and program orientation;
- image and marketing of the colleges to students and clients;

- funding;
- human resource development;
- flexibility; and
- standards.

NOTE on Themes and Sources:

For some themes there was much discussion and almost universal support (i.e., open accessibility; the need for assessment services, preparatory and remedial services; human resource development; consideration of adult learner characteristics; support for generic skills and general education; some statement of standards and more flexibility).

There were some topics which everyone endorsed but then discussed very little. For example, many people across the system support the co-operative mode of delivering education. Very few discussed what this meant, why it was good, what the costs would be, and if there were any problems. [Note the exception here is # 89 submitted by the Co-operative Educators Group].

Often, themes were embedded one in another. For example, both college and community authors endorsed co-operative education as a good way to deal with adult learners and foster closer relationships with business and community. Some of the reasons why people called for some consistency (standards) across the province were related to accreditation, credentials, student and credit transferability, and the ability to market clearly the colleges' courses and services.

Certain themes were found by Study Team 4 to warrant further research. In such cases, the related visions were used by study team members, researchers, and writers to develop background papers. Authors of visions will find their ideas and recommendations embedded in the volumes Challenges to the College and the College System. Background Papers and Challenges to the College and the College System. Study Team 4 Final Report.

What follows is some discussion of the themes and sub-themes that emerged from the submissions. Since many of the themes are interrelated, we have placed the sub-themes where the authors addressed them.

Colleges and the College System Mandate

1. Accessibility:

Providing access to meaningful post-secondary education and training opportunities was overwhelmingly seen to be the major goal of the authors of visions.

The operational definition of accessibility used by Study Team 4 has two dimensions — the opportunity to enrol (availability) and the opportunity to succeed (success). The visions discussed many aspects of access and connected this theme with many other Mandate, Learning Process and Governance themes.

Since the colleges were seen as community resources, access to the planning, development, and evaluation of college services and programming was also addressed.

This part of the Themes/Sources report will organize the thoughts of the visions into three sections — Availability, Success and Implications.

2. Availability

The prevailing opinion of those who submitted visions is that the College System needs to provide open access to alternative post-secondary education. This is strong support for the original mandate. There are several perspectives on this 'open' access theme.

a. *Community:*

The majority of visions supported the idea of a community focus for the colleges. Authors argued that the programming and services of the colleges should be responsive to the needs of the business, social and cultural communities and the individual within those communities. Many visions spoke of a need for 'closer' relationships and more meaningful roles for community members in providing advice, participating in planning, evaluation and accreditation.

Authors discussed the role of advisory committee members as providing significant advice and the need for college personnel to use this advice in more meaningful ways. Some visions supported the idea that more participatory management styles should be adopted, including students, staff, alumni and community on the appropriate governing bodies. Authors elaborated on the support and authority members of these groups would need to play full roles.

Many felt that access and quality were directly linked. Access would only be a goal if the quality of education was high. Several visions expressed the opinion that participation from external groups (such as professional associations and representatives of the community) was particularly important for the evaluative phase of education (i.e., accreditation, standards, credentials).

Many authors felt the colleges had resources that should be used in partnership with the community. Faculty exchanges, facility sharing, expertise sharing (for example, in technology diffusion) were all aspects of providing access to the colleges through applied research. This was seen to be a way for the community and the colleges to develop a true partnership relationship.

Arguing for responsiveness, authors described the colleges' need to be actively involved in researching the current and future human resource, social, cultural and technological needs of the community. This research would also include descriptive information about current and future students/clients. The colleges were then expected to use this information for planning and development.

Some felt that in many communities the colleges could be the brokers of information amongst business, industry, community and government. Several visions suggested that colleges become information centres for provincial programs and ministries.

b. Local, regional and provincial access:

The sense of community outlined above was very much 'local' community. Access was tied into the sense of flexibility, student-centred education, and the characteristics of the adult learner (see Learning Process section). Many authors believed it was unlikely that adults, due to family and job involvement, would travel very far. They urged more flexible modes of delivery, more satellite campuses, and more short intensive courses. For full-time students, the authors supported the provision of residences.

There were some authors who felt that any attempt to 'regionalize' colleges would decrease the community nature of colleges, reduce responsiveness and create access barriers. Other visions described the trade-off amongst access, efficiency and quality which a regional college system would impose. One vision suggested that eight regional colleges be established to concentrate the resources of the system. These resources could then be used to improve quality, efficiency and provide access in other terms (e.g., access to Centres of Excellence).

Quality and efficiency arguments were often linked in developing support for specialization and advanced training opportunities. These visions often had a 'practical' tone to them — "Let's face it, we aren't going to get more money, but these are important things to do. Therefore, we will have to have some colleges concentrate on the things that they do well." In some cases, authors felt that there were regionally unique offerings which would lead to specialization.

However, many visions supported the idea that all colleges should offer access to a wide range of educational opportunities –- from addressing basic literacy needs through to degree opportunities. The opinion that colleges should provide access to all adults, whatever their educational or training needs, was also strongly expressed. Many visions spoke about the need to provide this broad base access in terms of lifelong learning through educational laddering.

Achievement of higher skill and knowledge levels and the associated credentials were part of the access and lifelong learning discussions. Many college and community people felt that the colleges could not ignore the 'professional' demands for degrees. This led to the call for more agreements between colleges and universities (most student visions called for this). Other authors argued that colleges become degree granting institutions.

Authors more focussed on retraining needs recommended intensive courses leading to certificates. One argument put forward was that although more groups were expecting more access, because of the increasing number of adults in the composition of the expected student body, the colleges likely could concentrate more on career *development* opportunities and less on career *preparation*.

The flexibility and equity discussions about access were often interwoven. Many authors of visions urged steps to make colleges and curriculum more responsive to community and student characteristics. Sensitive scheduling (time and location), facilities modification, alternative delivery modes were part of the 'responsive' access discussion.

Many authors saw a more proactive role for the colleges in providing equity of access — not just to the colleges but also to society. This proactive role involves a cycle of research of community needs; building curriculum tailored to special needs (either student or community based); providing physical access and support services to ensure academic and career success; and for the colleges to act as 'values' models. In this regard, some visions urged that colleges organize themselves to model such values as equity, professionalism, responsiveness, entrepreneurialism, business principles, a concern for culture and a concern for the environment. Authors felt that faculty and staff selection, curriculum, Boards of Governors and Advisory Committees should reflect this concern for equity.

As an aspect of governance, several visions spoke to a 'decentralization' of the college system in order to provide access. "Decentralization will result in education that cares" was one repeated opinion.

Closely related to access and governance themes is the question of autonomy. Many felt that due to the community orientation of the colleges, all decision making must be done locally. Some authors felt that colleges should be able to approve programs on their own.

Access and funding were discussed by several authors of visions. One college recognized that complete local autonomy likely meant that it would have to be more self supporting in terms of funding.

Some visions felt that providing more access to a wider range of educational opportunities in a more equitable, flexible manner could only be done with more funding. Several provincial committees argued that colleges would have to diversify funding sources in order to provide quality and accessibility. Many of the 'success' aspects of the definition of access would seem to have funding implications — either for more funding or for reallocation of what the colleges currently have.

3. Success

Many visions supported the idea that the opportunity to succeed was an important dimension of access. In terms of the services required to provide the opportunity for success, several seemed to stand out in the visions.

Assessment of students for placement was supported by many. The goal here was to obtain a match between skills and educational opportunity. Inaccurate placement on the ladder of educational opportunity was cited as one of the major causes of student attrition. (Several visions pointed out that although assessment would cost, there already was a human and financial cost to attrition. As well, they pointed out that if attrition could be reduced through the provision of assessment services, assessment costs would likely be recovered through increased retention).

Preparatory and remedial opportunities were seen by many authors of visions as critical elements of the 'access with success' formula. Preparatory work was often seen to include literacy, numeracy, language skills, or discipline related cognitive abilities. Remedial opportunities are seen to be critical for those who encounter cognitive, attitudinal or skill based difficulties during courses. Some of these difficulties were seen to result from a mismatch between teaching and learning styles, external pressures (such as those resulting from some of the role conflicts many students encounter — parent, employee, student) or other factors.

Other required services included the "integrated career, academic and personal counselling necessary for lifelong learning" [#103 — Ontario College Counsellors].

In terms of the community, many submissions stated that colleges must see themselves as members of the community. Colleges also needed to be more active in researching community needs and then acting on those where education or training can make a difference. The colleges' learning resource centres were seen by some authors as resources which could become more community oriented.

As outlined in the Governance/Standards discussion,[1] there are a mix of perspectives on the question of how standards will impact accessibility. Some felt that the clarity of objectives which results from standards will help people gain access to that education which they will value and need. Others contended that higher standards will lead to more quality, increased efficiency, and more transferability of credits. The result would be increased access to other parts of the educational ladder.

For some authors these benefits were felt to be valuable enough to 'trade-off' some access. A few wrote that standards are an important step in developing the credentials that students and professions seem to feel are needed.

Some visions argued that quality and access should not be trade-offs. These visions described the role that other measures — such as preparatory and remedial services — could play in qualifying people for curriculum with entrance standards. In fact, some argued that one of the major roles of the colleges should be to teach people how to learn in order to succeed.

This process of establishing standards for curriculum and 'front end' services — assessment, preparatory, remedial services — was endorsed by many as critical to serving employer and student needs. These needs are expressed in 'mandate' terms by many authors as the need of the colleges to provide access to career education within broad based culturally, significant general education.

In summary,[2] success could be seen to be provided when:

- curriculum is organized at many levels;
- assessment of student level of skills occurs to ensure accurate placement;
- instruction focuses on moving the student from the current level to a level required for a chosen occupation;
- timelines and facilities barriers are minimized; and
- learning packages are created which are tailored to student needs.

4. Implications of Visions on Accessibility Theme

1. There are known barriers to accessibility. These include geography, attitudes, finances, curriculum standards, lack of research on community, employer and student needs (or its lack of implementation), and lack of services and facilities.
2. There are trade-offs amongst accessibility, efficiency, and quality.
3. Accessibility and equity are linked. Should/can colleges be models of such values for their communities and the province?
4. Curriculum standards, credentials, and the educational ladder of opportunity are important concepts in the accessibility discussion.
5. Specialization of curriculum and access to broad-based educational opportunities may be in conflict.
6. Governance issues such as 'decentralization' of system decisions and the autonomy of colleges are linked to accessibility.

---

[1] See section in this paper entitled Governance, 1.Standards.

[2] See Vision #123, "Let's Be Flexible," David Chesterton, Durham College

7. Open access and responsiveness to local community need are strongly felt values of those who submitted visions. This would appear to support the renewal of the existing mandate for the college system.
8. The belief is that sufficient resources are not currently available in order to:
    - support these values
    - remove the barriers
    - realize the mandate.

Learning Process

1. Flexibility, Student/Client-Centred Perspective, Adult Learners:

Three of the most often discussed themes in the visions were

- the need for the colleges to become more student-centred;
- the recognition of adult learner needs in terms of curriculum, services and instructional techniques; and
- the need for more flexibility in terms of programs and services.

Some visions linked these issues; others addressed individual aspects. Visions on these themes discussed learner characteristics, curriculum, responsive teaching and learning strategies, services, resources and facilities. Many authors felt that how the colleges organized themselves on these issues would help define their future.

2. The Adult Learner

People across the system understand the changing profile of Ontario's population. Approximately 80 per cent of the Visions considered the aging population and an older student group as major factors to be considered in the review of the college system mandate.

There are several dimensions to the discussion of the adult learner — the context of the education and training adults are likely to seek; the impact of life characteristics; the nature of the curriculum, services and facilities required.

a. The context of adult education:

Some authors suggested that the non-university, adult learner (anyone over 18 seemed the usual definition) should be the exclusive domain of the colleges. Some visions discussed the adult in terms of lifelong learning patterns which would include the need for repeated opportunities for training and upgrading. These opportunities would result from either career change or the need for enhanced productivity skills. Specific areas for development were seen to be technology awareness, communication, interpersonal and problem solving skills, and global awareness.

Prior formal learning and the work experience adults would bring to educational opportunities were seen to be both positive and negative influences. Certainly, the need for assessment of adult learners' previous education, training, skills, attitudes and cognitive abilities acquired through work and life experience was seen to be a priority.

b.The impact of life characteristics on adult education:

In terms of life characteristics, authors were sensitive to the fact that adult learners were likely to have many pressures along with academic concerns. There were many suggestions for the provision of day-care and other services related to adult learners' roles in a family. This connection to family was also seen as a factor working against regionally or provincially organized courses or programs (even if they are associated with a Centre of Excellence concept). Because of family, community and job requirements, adults were seen to be less willing or able to move to other locations for extended periods of time for their training.

Many authors felt that most adults approaching the colleges would continue to work and thus, would only be available part of the time for education and training. Several visions suggested looking at the student body in clusters — such as 18 - 24 age group; 25 - 54 age group; 55+ age group. Using these clusters, authors felt that distinct characteristics, needs and educational priorities could be detected within the adult learner group.

Many visions referred to adults who had retired from the workforce. It was noted that these adults had different motivations for connecting to the college (leisure time, values oriented, service oriented) and needed different programming.

c. Curriculum:

Family/employment circumstances and previous learning experiences shaped many of the curriculum recommendations. Many authors predict that adults will want a more skills oriented curriculum (for both retraining and 'upgrading' purposes). Many visions urged that the colleges address the various literacy needs of adults (communication, reading, math, technology, computer).

Some visions explored the need for management skills as a significant part of adult oriented curriculum.

There were many discipline-specific recommendations. Many Health Services practitioners and educators commented on the need for the colleges to address the issue of the changing nature of the health care system in Ontario as part of their adult oriented curriculum. Similar visions emerged from professional associations and college personnel involved with technology education. Several visions dealt with the need to work with business oriented curriculum from a lifelong learning perspective. Professionals involved in Arts and Crafts presented ideas on lifelong learning strategies, the relationship among arts, crafts and community, and the colleges' role in providing education, training and facilities.

The need to build adult students' ability and confidence *to learn how to learn* was seen by many authors to be a priority.

d. Services and facilities:

Because of the life circumstances of adults, many authors felt that adults would prefer short, intensive courses. Authors suggested that these should be offered year round, on a 24 hour, 7 days a week basis. Some visions suggested that 'continuous intake' should be a goal to strive for when addressing adult needs. Some authors felt that curriculum would need to be modular, and would need to be delivered in a variety of modes (e.g., group oriented, independent and self paced modes). Many spoke to the need to use more distance education approaches such as correspondence, video, audio, programmed texts, etc.

Adults were seen more likely to be 'part-time' learners. However, many authors pointed out that these part-time learners would demand equity with full time learners in terms of access, quality, facilities, services and credentials.

More flexible scheduling was seen to be needed — both in terms of location and timing. Needs were expressed for more 'on-job' site education; part-time access to full-time, day programming; and more streamlined registration and educational options counselling. Career counselling and training paths were mentioned often as needs of adults (and clients).

In general, many felt that the facilities and services of the college needed to be extended (or re-oriented) towards adult learners.

There were several visions dealing with the changing nature of Learning Resource Centres within the colleges. Learning Resource personnel felt that due to the changing student body, different learning strategies will be used that will require the learning resource centres to offer more flexible services. These would include access to a variety of national and international databases as well as print and other non-print resources. They recognized that 'clients,' instructors, and their own staff will need to develop new 'information technology' skills. Learning resource centres personnel stated that a new relationship must develop between learning resources and people involved in curriculum development and delivery. This is seen as a new form of partnership.

Many authors predicted that adults will require the faculty-student relationship to change. Most believed that faculty will increase their role as educational facilitators and consultants as adults assume more responsibility for their own learning. These authors contended that adults will be more open and willing to discuss the quality of the educational experience and ask to play a role in its evaluation.

Submissions discussed the credentials associated with the college learning experience for adults. Many felt that the need for credit transfers to other colleges and to university would be important for adult learners. Several discussed the concept of 'laddering' of credits as a strategy to offer learners the opportunity to continue their lifelong learning. Some felt that it would eventually require that colleges offer degrees. However, many also discussed the college experience as an alternative to university and a location where people who had not succeeded in high school could pursue education in an adult environment.

Some authors suggested that not just colleges need to adapt to the concept of lifelong learning. Society in general, and business in particular, needed to support lifelong learning. Education and training were seen by some as basic rights and thus arguments were made that such opportunities should be free or built into employment benefits packages. As an example, employees might have the right to sign up for post-secondary courses every five years. Others suggested a voucher system.

3. Student-Centred Education

Authors discussed this topic from two perspectives — students as clients and employers (business, industry, society) as clients. Regardless of their perspective, authors from agreed that courses, programs, services and institutions should not be the centre of focus. Instead they suggested that once the student or client becomes the centre of the colleges' focus, answers will become more clear to questions on the college mandate, curriculum, staffing, funding, and governance.

a. Diversity of students:

The diversity of the expected student body, including increasing numbers of adults, was of prime concern to most authors of visions. This diversity was seen to include

- at least three major age groupings of adults
- more people recently immigrated to Canada
- increasing numbers of women
- more native people
- more people who would have to have their special needs accommodated in order to be successful at college (some of these latter would have learning disabilities or physical limitations requiring special accommodation).

Many authors felt that the college system needed to be open to many students and our efforts should be focused on doing what we can to make the system better for students.

There are a number of equity concerns which emerge as the colleges move towards student-centred education. These are clearly described by Study Team 3's papers and the visions they received.[3] Certainly, many authors felt the need for colleges to address gender balance in terms of enrollment, positive models (such as instructors and managers) and placements. Similar concerns were expressed in regards to native people and those with learning or physical abilities.

b. Curriculum:

Most of the discussions had to do with how curriculum should be delivered rather than what would be involved. Certainly, many visions cited the need for student-centred curriculum to be current and relevant. Some authors were concerned about the involvement of business and community in the development and evaluation of curriculum. Several felt that evaluation should involve a variety of stakeholders and some felt that accreditation should be done by external agents.

There were a number of visions which addressed the need to provide English (and other language) training for those whose first language might be something other than English. There were authors who felt that some students might require training in a language other than English. Certainly, the development of the 23rd College was seen to inspire more groups — such as native peoples — to move in this direction.

c. Services and facilities:

A variety of submissions referred to the need for improved training of all college personnel. They referred to training as a way to fulfil the colleges' number one goal —providing a good service to students.

Other visions concerned in this area supported the need for all colleges to provide assessment, preparatory and remedial services to students. Assessment services were seen to be needed primarily to determine students' current abilities in order to match them with the appropriate educational opportunity.

Concurrent with these assessment services was the need for other services. Chief amongst these were

- preparatory and remedial services and materials which would develop success patterns and skills
- counselling services to provide direction and support for the person as well as the student
- learning resources which are available and relevant to the curriculum
- career counselling

Many authors mentioned a need for physical facilities to be developed and managed in a flexible manner. This had to do with the timing of classes, the availability of services, the provision for physical access, the use of facilities as a community resource as well as an academic facility.

Authors pointed out that teachers and academic managers would need to be educated about teaching and learning strategies which placed student learning rather than curriculum delivery at the centre of the education process. Learning styles, social styles, skills levels, attitudes, previous experiences, student goals and objectives were all seen as major factors in developing student-centred education.

---

[3] NOTE: There is a similar report to this for the visions submitted to Study Team 3. See Aspinall, Francie, "Meeting the Needs of Diverse Learners: Submissions from Community Organizations and the Colleges," in Colleges and the Communities. Background Papers. (Toronto: Ontario Council of Regents), 1990.

4. Client-Centred Education

Here authors saw two roles for the colleges: 1) preparing students for entry-level career positions; and 2) retraining of human resources for business, industry and society.

Many authors saw education as a subsystem of the social and economic systems. Graduates are products of this subsystem which serves the larger systems.

a. *Curriculum:*

Of prime importance to the colleges was the involvement of business, industry and community in determining both the what and, increasingly, the how of education.

Critical to the development of curriculum is research. According to the submissions, the development of needs and task analysis information is part of this. Participation of 'community' representatives in determining the curriculum priorities based on research and consultations was seen to be crucial.

Authors suggested that client-centred curriculum should anticipate future trends, provide a sense of the entrepreneurial attitude, include a core of generic skills, provide a general education with concrete, current skills. Of equal importance to many authors here was the development of those attitudes towards the economy which will sustain current business practices.

Curriculum that has been researched, prioritized, mutually determined, current, relevant, frequently evaluated, and externally accredited seemed to be the goal of the visions which touched upon this topic.

b. *Strategies, services and facilities:*

Cooperative education was strongly endorsed. To a certain extent this endorsement seemed to be uncritical. There did not seem to be much linkage of student characteristics, learning task and learning mode in determining the value of cooperative education as a mode of learning. The strength of support for cooperative education may come from the concerns about the currency, relevancy and attitudinal aspects of education.

Some visions advocated that more independent learning modes be used since employee availability is often limited. As well, some authors felt that college courses should be offered at the job site, both to provide access and to ensure currency through the use of industry facilities.

Throughout these visions was a concern about the timeliness of education and training offered. Colleges are expected to analyze local, provincial, national and international needs and respond quickly. This ability to listen attentively and respond quickly is much valued by proponents of client-centred education.

Among the other services valued are those which support the business/community and college relationship. Colleges are expected to provide liaison people of several types. The participation of community people on advisory committees, industrial training committees, community planning committees, and Boards of Governors is noted as critical to the development of client-centred education.

Several professional groups have clear visions about their role in delivering and accrediting education provided by the colleges. Several authors suggested provincial committees to ensure the development of client-centred education.

Facilities, such as equipment related to curriculum, were of much concern to many professional and industrial groups who submitted visions.

5. Flexibility

Generally, flexibility is the theme or issue which can be captured by the phrase "Most things to more people."

This need is influenced strongly by the prospect of a more diverse student body. Flexibility is seen to be needed to encourage lifelong learning patterns. Some visions linked flexibility with efficiency of operation. Such a request for more services will extend costs but also provide increased accessibility and improve student retention. More services were thought to improve enrolment and lower per capita costs.

a. Flexibility and students:

The colleges are asked to be very flexible in their views of students. Students requested to be seen as:

- skill seekers;
- part-time learners;
- people with previous experience which needs to be respected but not held against them;
- people who need help in learning to learn;
- people who need a second/third/fourth chance in life;
- people who seek a balanced education which will prepare them for life both in a local community and in an increasingly 'global' world;
- people who have families and therefore need daycare, residences, funding, health care, career and academic counselling;
- clients who should be serviced;
- people seeking credentials;
- people seeking preparation to climb educational ladders;
- people seeking entry into the workforce and the social community;
- adults;
- people with special needs; and
- people who expect that their ethnic, cultural, linguistic, citizen and human rights will be respected, protected and encouraged.

b. Curriculum:

In terms of 'most things,' certainly the visions spoke to a community need for curriculum in a wide-range of current, relevant subject areas and at a wide range of academic levels — pre-college, certificate, two-year and three-year diplomas, post-diploma, degree and advanced training.

As cited above, the use of instructional technology and a variety of instructional strategies was felt by many authors to be important to make curriculum student-centred and flexible.

Cooperative education mode of delivery of curriculum was cited by many as being more flexible since it was seen to provide an alternative to conventional work/education patterns.

The transferability needs of lifelong learners were clearly outlined. This was seen to be an important factor for all learners. Authors spoke to the need for more cooperation between colleges and universities to achieve improved flexibility.

c. Services and facilities:

Authors from across the system established the goal that individual students and clients be responded to in a timely, participatory manner. Although this attests to the willingness of the system to be flexible the question remains "how to get there?"

In addition to the many suggestions for curriculum to be adapted for differing student characteristics, several authors discussed flexibility in governance terms.

The role of advisory committees was discussed by some. Generally, authors felt that advisory committees needed to be given more meaningful roles. Other authors expressed the need for more leadership on making institutions responsive. Participatory management, good communications and honest, clear involvement of citizens were all felt to be critical to achieving the goal of making colleges more flexible

Such governance concerns usually led authors to the conclusion that such strong community ties also implied local autonomy in decision making in order to provide flexibility. Centralized decision making was felt to be remote and inflexible. Some authors felt that the increasingly diverse sources of funding for colleges strengthened local autonomy and flexibility.

The college facilities were seen to be community resources in a broad sense and generally ought to be scheduled as such. Year round usage was urged. This request for services and access extended to counselling, learning resource centres and recreational facilities. Some authors felt that businesses, unions and labour councils should have on-campus offices to enhance those relationships.

The final component of flexibility involved the need for evaluation. People supported ideas as diverse as province wide exams, multiple perspective performance review for faculty and managers, frequent course and program review and external accreditation.

6. Implications of Flexibility, Student/Client-Centred Education, and Adult Education

For the authors of visions there is a need to make curriculum more accessible to part-time learners. This includes the extension of services, facilities and credentials to part-time learners.

Most of the system felt that the matching of entering students with the appropriate educational offering could only be done by assessing student skills and knowledge. Visions indicated that the goal of such assessment services should be to provide such a match.

Mismatching students with educational offerings was felt to be related to student retention and attrition.

A variety of alternative delivery strategies needed to be researched and implemented in order to provide more accessibility and ultimately, more efficiency. This includes off-campus delivery.

Many authors stated that the management of facilities needed to become more flexible.

More representatives of the diversity of student body need to be hired to develop curriculum sensitively, act as role models, enrich the college community and encourage equity.

Training for all college personnel on how to provide service to students is required. Part of this training should be for people involved in the business/community and college relationship.

Governance

1. Standards

One of the most discussed themes in the visions (as well in other consultations with the college system) was curriculum standards. The discussion of standards could be included either in the section on the Learning Process or in this section on how the colleges organize themselves to address issues confronting them. The discussion is included here since most vision authors saw the issue as one which would require a change in how the colleges governed themselves.

There were two aspects to standards which authors considered. Uniformity was one aspect of standards which most people did not support. Many of the fears of uniformity imposed by standards were connected to the desire to remain responsive in order to meet local needs and priorities.

However, consistency as an outcome of standards was endorsed. Consistency was seen to be a flexible concept. Authors felt that consistent outcomes were achievable without having uniform methods to attain standards imposed. In this manner, some authors felt that colleges could be responsive to community needs and create consistent standards.

Standards were seen to help answer to the question of "What is a College Graduate?"

The visions established several dimensions to the Standards discussion. Visions from advisory committees, faculty, and administration discussed standards in terms of curriculum and

- the need to prepare students for careers;
- the need to meet human resource needs of business and society [especially, technology oriented activities to make the economy thrive]; and
- the need for business and industry to understand what they are getting when they hire a graduate.

Many authors from a variety of sources indicated the changing nature of the discipline in which they were involved.[4] While arguing for change, the visions also touched upon the need for flexibility of curriculum, and entry and exit standards. Concerns about 'currency' of curriculum and how to assure currency, surface in this dimension. Some believe that almost all programs should have a field placement or co-operative mode in order to provide students with an understanding of the climate of the work world.

Of concern in the curriculum and standards discussion is the distinction between the 'part-time learner' and others. What are the curriculum and accreditation differences? What are the funding and services differences? If there are differences, should they exist?

---

[4] For example, Health Services — almost all Health Service Committees, Faculty, Management, and Community, suggest the nature of health services in the province is undergoing change. Therefore, the people argue for a change in the content and methodology of the Health Sciences curriculum. As well, they see the need for services to be provided not only to those joining the profession, but also for those currently part of the profession who need 'upgrading' or 'retraining'. Other Visions related to Business, Technology, the Arts, Applied Arts, speak to similar changes.)

There was much, passionate discussion about the need for general education standards for all college students.[5]

Other visions discussed the need for standards regarding the teaching process. This concern focused on the need to hire the appropriate people, train them to use the best methods, provide on-going support (training and resources) and, in particular, give them skills to assess and prepare students to be successful. Other specific recommendations were made regarding teaching strategies and delivery modes (such as the need for co-operative education).

Consistently, many in the system argue for some standard of teacher preparation and training (both initial and on-going).

Often, the arguments related to student-centred approaches — independent learning modes, modularized curriculum, more use of instructional technology, field placements and co-operative education — and the subsequent evolution of instructors as facilitators, counsellors, and mentors in their relationship to students were connected to discussions of standards. As well, the role of the instructor was discussed in connecting to schools, universities, advisory committees, community and business to assure that standards are being met.

As mentioned, some visions concentrated on the need to establish entrance standards. These authors usually connected this argument into the need for assessment services. Combined with this is the institutional need to provide preparatory services for those who need them in order to gain entrance (accessibility goal). For those who gain entrance and experience difficulties, remedial help was called for in order to maintain the curriculum standards and provide for student success.

Some visions concentrated on the need for exit standards and the issue of accreditation. Authors argued for direct involvement of community and business in the evolution and accreditation of the exit standards. Several professional groups and community advisory groups strongly recommended that "self policing is not an effective method of maintaining excellence...[and feel that]...the Council of Regents does not have the time nor expertise to provide this service."[6] They suggested an external accreditation process. Others felt that this must be a shared responsibility.

Both entrance and exit standards, along with the credentials of the instructors, were important to those people concerned about the transferability of student and credits to other colleges, universities or educational jurisdictions.

From a different perspective, there were some visions concerned about the relationship of the college to its local community. In some cases, provincial wide standards were rejected since the 'local' relationship between college and community was felt to be the prime aspect of the college mandate.

This local relationship also led some to express the opinion that there should be a minimum standard of funding for colleges based on the core of activities needed to support the community needs.

In summary, the visions considered a variety of dimensions of standards:

- the nature of students;

---

[5] See Michael Parks, "Expanding the Core: General Education, Generic Skills and Core Curriculum in Ontario's Community Colleges," in Challenges to the College and the College System. Background Papers. (Toronto: Ontario Council of Regents), 1990.

- the nature of graduates;
- several aspects of curriculum (what, how it is evolved, how it is accredited);
- entrance and exit standards;
- the related need for assessment, preparatory and remedial resources;
- the role of business, community and college personnel in establishing and maintaining standards; and
- the funding related to the relationship of the college to its community.

2. Participation in Decision-Making and Local Autonomy

The issue of how a college or the colleges organize to govern was addressed both directly and indirectly. Part of the discussion involved how to deal with issues such as the need for transfer of credits, the need to be flexible, the provisions for standards, accreditation, credentials, and image of the college. In the following section the two dimensions of governance which will be addressed involve participation in decision making and local autonomy.

a. Participation in governance:

Generally, authors of visions valued increased participation believing the benefits to be:

- increased communication with and a better understanding of the needs of the community;
- the establishment of an active, closer relationship with business, labour, community, schools, universities, and college staff; and
- the formation of partnerships for accountability, planning and problem-solving.

Visions from community groups sought increased and more meaningful participation. Internal groups reiterated their desire to be more directly involved and be given equal rights to others on committees and Boards. Both internal and external visions supported the idea of broader representation and often tied this into the diversifying population.

Many authors of visions felt that the role of the advisory committees needed attention. Several community groups, in seeking access to advisory committees, felt that these committees, currently, were limited in their actual impact on problem-solving and decision making. One vision suggested that the program Dean should be accountable for taking action on the recommendations of the advisory committee. Others seemed to feel that a direct reporting relationship with the Board of Governors was the way to ensure that an advisory committee ideas were acted upon.

Many authors felt that there should be broader, more diversified representation on the Board of Governors. These visions tended to support more regional representation, more community representatives, more labour input, and more business participation. There were some suggestions that the policies regarding both Board and Advisory Committee appointments needed reevalution (e.g., some thought these representatives should be elected).

Several of the visions from 'internal' groups or individuals felt that the membership and role of College and Academic Councils needed similar modifications.

b. Local autonomy:

Most, but not all, of the visions supported some type of 'local autonomy.' This recommendation was based on the priority authors placed on the colleges as flexible, responsive, community oriented institutions. A central or regional organization of colleges' programming or services implied to these authors that information, decision making and plans of action would become remote from community needs.

Some authors felt that certain issues could only be dealt with or were more effectively dealt with on a regional or provincial basis. Curriculum standards was the most prominent of these issues.

In terms of the case for local autonomy, one of the arguments which surfaced several times was that internal and external communication is enhanced when the college has autonomy to deal with its community. Shared problem-solving, the identification of local barriers, and the sharing of resources to act on challenges were all seen to be part of the case. It was felt by many authors that, in this manner, a 'local' team would be built and the appropriate corporate culture could be developed.

Several visions felt that local autonomy was necessary for program review, operational review, management and staff appraisal, and curriculum review. These evaluation processes could then be tied into the appropriate human resource development activities. Local control and flexibility in these matters emerged as a priority.

In only a few cases was local autonomy and funding connected. Several authors did state that local autonomy implied that their college would have to become more self-supporting financially.

The arguments for regional and central governance supported the idea that funding would or should come from the provincial government. In fact, several visions felt that there should be 'baseline' or 'core' funding from the province to support the community nature of their college.

Authors discussed the diverse benefits from regional or provincial governance. Some felt that the competitive nature of the current system might be minimized and more collaborative activities might result. The development of Centres of Excellence and a provincially consistent curriculum — particularly based on consistent exit standards — were seen to be more likely to occur with a regionally or provincially structured college system.

Many authors felt that there was an important job to be done in coordinating the resources of the provincial and federal governments. Diverse sources of funding meant colleges were less dependent on any one source, but also that colleges had to have administrative and other services which could develop and track funding sources.

A number of authors felt that only through provincial direction would the general education component of college education be reintroduced.

Some felt that there were system-wide or regional aspects to the human resource development (HRD) needs of college personnel. Thus, there was support for some HRD activities at these levels.

Several provincial committees making submissions, as well as individuals, supported the idea that some services should be provided centrally. One vision distinguished between central control and central provision of services. Some of the services suggested for central provision were:

- financial aid information;
- educational and institutional research; and
- information and support for the implementation of provincial and federal legislation.

Several visions felt that accreditation and credentialling were best handled at the provincial level. Authors often felt that such provincial coordination would prevent the development of quality differences among colleges and ensure graduates and employers a standard of quality in education and training.

Arguments related to efficiency, coordination and credibility were used to support the suggestions for the provision of these services at this level.

Various provincial 'agencies' were suggested to take leadership in ensuring improved governance. The Committee of Presidents, ACAATO, the Council of Regents, and the Ministry of Colleges and Universities were all supported as agencies to demonstrate leadership on these provincial issues. Some authors suggested that new structures and agencies — in some cases, task specific groups — emerge to deal with system-wide issues.

c. *Implications:*

There are several questions which need to be addressed regarding both participation and autonomy:

1. How can national or provincial (professional, business, labour) organizations get direct, meaningful participation with locally autonomous colleges?
2. What are the dimensions of accountability in a local, autonomous college?
3. Given the tendency of colleges to 'trim' general education in times of financial pressure, how could the priority which seems to emerge from the visions (and other study teams) be acted upon?
4. Would local colleges each have to negotiate articulation agreements with school boards, universities and other educational jurisdictions?
5. How would the increasing, professional thrust towards credentials be dealt with by autonomous colleges?
6. What changes to legislation would be needed to make the colleges autonomous in all matters?
7. What would be the impact on labour relations of autonomous colleges?

Conclusions

The Imagine Your College project was completely successful from the perspective of Study Team 4. A rich, diverse flow of information helped direct the discussion and analysis of the major needs, priorities, barriers and recommendations for action. The visioning process enabled those within the college to get involved, think strategically and make a contribution to the system.

People were generous with their ideas. Authors reminded the study team to consider the achievements of the colleges. As well, they challenged the study team to examine the need and opportunities for positive change and development.

The information gathered in this manner provided a worthwhile balance to the reactive ideas and opinions which the Discussion Brief, *Pressures for Change, Opportunities for Development*, stimulated.

The visions demonstrate a degree of professionalism, creativity and readiness for change which signals a positive role for the colleges in Ontario's future.

Appendix 1: Visions Submitted

1 *Self Generated Utopian View of Photographic Education in Ontario*
Stan White, Teaching Master
Sheridan College

2 *Governance, Program and System Rationalization, College-Government Relationships*
OPSEU Local 658 - Support Staff
Canadore College

3 *Vocational Education & General Education: Friends or Foes?*
Bruce McAusland, Former President
St. Clair College

4 *The Multiple Mission of Colleges*
Bruce McAusland, Former President
St. Clair College

5 *Advisory Committees, General and Applied Learning, Rationalization, Applied Research*
Joanne Harrack, Director, Education & Training
Connaught Laboratories

6 *The Teaching of English as a Second Language in a College Setting*
Members, TESL, Ontario, Submitted by Ernest V.C. Harris, President
Teachers of English as a Second Language Association

7 *How Can We Excel in the Decade Ahead?*
Margaret Samuel, Former Chair, Office Administration Program
Sheridan College

8 *What Vision 2000 Might Learn by Using Travel and Tourism as a Case*
Richard Mansfield, Coordinator, Travel and Tourism
Loyalist College

9 *The College Placement Group Vision for the Year 2000*
College Placement Group, Submitted by R. B. Armstrong, Confederation
ACAATO Committee

10 *Preparing for Change: Dealing with the Needs of Diverse Adult Learners*
M. Evans-Merrill, Department of Adult Education
Algonquin College

11 *The Need for College-Industrial Liaison and Training*
Michael Deciantis, Crothers Caterpillar
Sault College Automotive Advisory Committee

12 *Program Rationalization-Cooperation-Basic and General Level Students*
Gary Monteith, Chair of Business
Sault College

13 *Redefining the Role of the College System Towards Job Oriented Programs*
Bruce Campbell, Faculty
Sault College

14 *On Hopes for the College System and Glimpses of What it Will Be*
Fred Case, Teaching Master
Sault College

15 *Report from the Long Range Planning Committee*
Long Range Planning Committee Submission, Harry Greenwood, Chair
Mohawk College

16 *Role of Liberal Studies in Seneca College (Brief to Profile 93 Task Force)*
Liberal Studies Faculty, Profile 93 Task Force Brief prepared by Diane Meaghan
Seneca College

17 *Colleges and the General Education Mandate*
Social Science Faculty Group
Niagara College

18 *Student Financial Aid*
Ontario Association of College Financial Aid Administrators, Submitted by Christine Wolch, Chair
ACAATO Committee

19 *A Vision of Canadore College*
Canadore College Council, Submitted by Mike Manson, Assistant to President
Canadore College

20 *What Should Ontario's College System (Physically) Look Like in the Year 2000*
OCAAT Commitee of Plant Directors, Submitted by Richard P. Court, Mohawk, Chair
ACAATO Committee

21 *Program Rationalization*
Bert White, Associate Dean Technology
Humber College

22 *Report of the Fanshawe College Vision 2000 Seminar, May 14, 1989*
Vision 2000 Campus Seminar Participants, Prepared by Don Blay
Fanshawe College

23 *College-Industry Relations*
Computer Engineering Technology Advisory Committee
Submitted by Michael J. Irwin, Mgr., Information Network Development
St. Lawrence College

24 *An OPSEU Local Persepctive*
OPSEU Local 656 - Support Staff
Cambrian College

25 *Role of Colleges in Rural Areas and the Relevance of Culturally Oriented Subjects*
School of Design and Visual Art, Prepared by Peter Miehm
Georgian College

26 *Future Changes Required in the Nursing Assistant Program and Comments on Mini Scan*
Nursing Assistant Advisory Committee
Loyalist College

27 *Gazing From the Library, Anderson Resource Centre, Loyalist College*
Beatrice Lo, Supervisor, Library Resources
Loyalist College

28 *Highlighting the Importance of Feedback for Growth and Excerpts from "Grow or Die"*
Theresa Lapierre, Faculty
St. Clair College

29 *A Collective Response from the Chairman's Group*
Chairs' Group
Mohawk College

30 *Character Skill Development Through Leisure Education*
Bob Scott, Lyn Wright, Brad Doey, Leisure Education Faculty
Mohawk College

31 *Visions Resulting From the Algonquin College Vision 2000 Workshop, May 10, 1989*
College Academic Council
Algonquin College

32 *Report on Exploration of Alternate Delivery of Programs*
Dianne Bloor, Cathy Thom, Faculty Members, Health Sciences
Algonquin College

33 *Our College in the Year 2000*
Business Programs Advisory Committee, submitted by Dianne Beattie, Chair & Jay Ertel, Administrative Liaison
St. Clair College, Thames Campus

34 *How to Save General Education in Ontario Community Colleges*
Michael Park, English Faculty
Centennial College

35 *Trades and Technology Training*
Bert Hopkins, Chair, Electronics Technology
Algonquin College

36 *Ethics - A Whisper Along the Corridors of Power*
John Wheeler, Teaching Master, School of Visual Arts
Sheridan College

37 *"Imagine Your College -Your College and Its Community"*
Developmental Services Worker Program Advisory Committee
St. Clair College (Thames Campus)

38 *Technology Training for the Future*
Andrew Kellner, President, Chemistry Chapter
Mohawk College Alumni Association

39 *Special Committee on Fine Arts*
Hans Albarda, Coordinator, School of Design and Visual Arts
Georgian College (Owen Sound Campus)

40 *Students Modes of Instruction and Educators*
Nursing Program Faculty & Students
Durham College

41 *Development and Strategy Plans*
Harriet Black, Former Council Member
Ontario Council of Regents

42 *MiniScan Submissions*
MiniScan Respondants: 50 College Staff Members, Submitted by Harry Greenwood, Chair,
Long Range Planning Committee
Mohawk College

43 *Response to Vision 2000 Booklet*
Andra McArtney
Trent University

44 *Recycling Disposable Materials for a Cleaner Environment*
Anthea Weese, Journalism Student
Loyalist College

45 *Linking Community Colleges with Canadian Universities*
G.S. Saini, Teaching Master
Northern College

46 *Mini Scan Submissions*
MiniScan Respondants: Part-Time Studies, Health Sciences Faculty
Submitted by Kate Kemp, Chair
Mohawk College

47 *Your College and the World Around It- Challenges to Durham College*
Stan Durrant, Manager, Ontario Skills Development Office
Durham College

48 *MiniScan Submission*
Submitted by Norm MacKenzie, President
Barrie and District Labour Council

49 *Secondary School Teachers Attitudes & Student Supply*
Len Robbins, Teaching Master
Georgian College

50 *Vision 2000 MiniScan Project*
Wm. A. Allen, Co-ordinator of Alternative and Continuing Education
The East Parry Sound Board of Education

41 *Development and Strategy Plans*
Harriet Black, Former Council Member
Ontario Council of Regents

42 *MiniScan Submissions*
MiniScan Respondants: 50 College Staff Members, Submitted by Harry Greenwood, Chair, Long Range Planning Committee
Mohawk College

43 *Response to Vision 2000 Booklet*
Andra McArtney
Trent University

44 *Recycling Disposable Materials for a Cleaner Environment*
Anthea Weese, Journalism Student
Loyalist College

45 *Linking Community Colleges with Canadian Universities*
G.S. Saini, Teaching Master
Northern College

46 *Mini Scan Submissions*
MiniScan Respondants: Part-Time Studies, Health Sciences Faculty
Submitted by Kate Kemp, Chair
Mohawk College

47 *Your College and the World Around It- Challenges to Durham College*
Stan Durrant, Manager, Ontario Skills Development Office
Durham College

48 *MiniScan Submission*
Submitted by Norm MacKenzie, President
Barrie and District Labour Council

49 *Secondary School Teachers Attitudes & Student Supply*
Len Robbins, Teaching Master
Georgian College

50 *Vision 2000 MiniScan Project*
Wm. A. Allen, Co-ordinator of Alternative and Continuing Education
The East Parry Sound Board of Education

51 *Role of General Education*
Dean Haggerty, Department Administrator, Arts and Science Department
Sir Sandford Fleming College

52 *Our Colleges in the Year 2000*
Fran Dew, Teaching Master, Business Department
Sault College

53 *Access to College For All Ontarians*
Marian Sinn, Adult Basic Education Department
Algonquin College

54 *Georgian College as Employer in the Year 2000*
Paul Tremblay, Coordinator, Mechanical/Industrial Technology
Georgian College

55 *Health Care Programs*
Alison Hunter, Health Planner/Executive Assistant
The Credit Valley Hospital, Mississauga

56 *MiniScan Submissions*
Marinus J. Vandermeer, Chair, Data Processing Advisory Committee
Representative of EDS of Canada
Durham College

57 *Diagnostic Imaging Relating to Needs of Departments*
Michael Romeo, Chief, Department of Diagnostic Radiology
Hamilton General Hospital

58 *MiniScan Submissions*
Sandra Black, Director of Learning Resources, Library Resource Centres
Mohawk College

59 *MiniScan Submissions*
MiniScan Respondants: College Students, Submitted by Bonnie-Ginter Brown,
Chair Nursing Diploma Program
Durham College

60A *MiniScan Submissions*
Association of Medical Radiation Technologists, Advisory Committee Chair,
and a local hospital technologist
Mohawk College

60C *MiniScan Submissions*
24 College Students, Staff and Community Members, Submitted by Harry Greenwood,
Chair, Long Range Planning Committee
Mohawk College

60B *MiniScan Submission*
Perinatal Nursing Advisory Committee, Submitted by Kate Kemp, Chair,
Continuing Education, Health Sciences
Mohawk College

61 *The Educational Needs of Franco-Ontarians*
Michel Parent, Project Coordinator & Administrator, French Language Services
Niagara College

62 *MiniScan Submission*
Midge Day, Teaching Master, Business Division
Durham College

63 *Concerns of Student Council of Porcupine Campus of Northern College*
Paul Stilges, President, Student Administrative Council
Northern College

64 *Identified Issues in Craft Education in Canada, May 1988, (Report of the Ontario Crafts Council)*
Gail Crawford, Associate Editor
Ontario Crafts Council

65 *MiniScan Submissions*
MiniScan Respondants, Submitted by Wayne Busch, President
Georgian College

66 *MiniScan Submissions*
MiniScan Respondants: College Staff and Students, Submitted by Maureen Piercy, Director,
Community Affairs
Loyalist College

67 *MiniScan Submission*
MiniScan Respondants: Members of Board of Governors
George Brown College

68 *Learning Resource Centers: MiniScan Report (Geneva Park Conference May 1989)*
Learning Resource Centers Annual Conference Participants, Submitted by Vihari Hivale, Humber
ACAATO Committee

69 *H.T.L. Divison - Changes in Colleges in the Decade Ahead*
Elizabeth Ashton, Dean Hospitality, Tourism, Leisure
Humber College

70 *Technology Training and Education*
J.Z. Havelka, Teaching Master, Technology
Humber College

71 *MiniScan Submission*
Department of Laboratory Medicine, Submitted by Brenda Grant, Administrative Co-ordinator
Hamilton Civic Hospitals, Hamilton General

72 *The Development of College Faculty*
George Geis, Chair, Higher Education Group
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

73 *Loyalist College as a Technical Trades Training Centre for Eastern Ontario*
David Parker, Director, Industrial Dev. Dept., Submitted by Maureen Piercy, Director, Community Affairs, Loyalist
City of Belleville, Industrial Development Department

74 *Financial Services Vision 2000 MiniScan*
Joseph Peterson, Director of Financial Services
Mohawk College

75 *Vision 1991 Improved Communications in the College System*
David Thackray, Teaching Master
Loyalist College

76 *MiniScan Submission*
George Lueddeke, Director, Educational Research and Development
Mohawk College

77 *The Requirement for a Polytechnic Education System for the Engineering Technology Divisions*
OACETT, Ontario Association of Certified Engineering Technicians and Technologists

78 *The Role of the Professional Association in the College System*
OACETT, Ontario Association of Certified Engineering Technicians and Technologists

79 *Task Force on Occupational Hygiene, Safety & Environment*
College Occupational Hygiene Advisory Committee, Submitted by W. Sandford,
Coordinator Operations, Physical Sciences Dept.
Mohawk College

80 *MiniScan Composite*
Western Region Heads of Nursing, Submitted by Mary K. Brown, Mohawk
ACAATO Sub-committee

81 *Focus on Relationships: Some Recommendations*
CAAT Support Staff
Metro Central Region Conference, May 1989

82 *Views of Humber College Board of Governors - Students, Structure , Governance*
Board of Governors, Karen E. O'Neill, Chair
Humber College

83 *Proposed College Participation in Jean Tallon Project*
Bert Mills, Teaching Master, Manufacturing/Mechanical/Construction
Niagara College

84 *MiniScan Submission*
Admissions Council
Loyalist College

85 *College Life in the Year 2000*
Kathern Bly, Advertising Student
Loyalist College

86 *Environmental Issues Facing Society*
Bert Hielema, Chair, Assessment, Appraisal, and Real Estate Advisory Committee
Loyalist College

87 *Vision 2000 - The Future of Ontario Colleges*
Gordon McTavish, Chair, Advisory Committee on Human Resource Management and
Employee of NEI Canada Limited
Niagara College

88 *Imagine Your College in the Year 2000*
Lambton College Vision 2000 Study Team of Faculty members, Submitted by Judith Oliver,
Nursing Faculty
Lambton College

89 *Vision of the Future of Co-operative Education*
College Co-operative Educators of Ontario, Submitted by Barry McGill, Chair
ACAATO Committee

90 *Summary Report from the Vision 2000 Process at St. Lawrence College*
St. Lawrence College Visions, Submitted by Robin Pepper, Communication Manager/
Vision 2000 Coordinator
St. Lawrence College

91 *Teaching Credentials/Hiring Patterns at One CAAT: Past, Present, and Future*
Corinne Falconer, Chair, Applied Arts
Seneca College

92 *MiniScan Submission: Contempory Nursing Assistant Views*
MiniScan Respondants: Nursing Assistants and Students, Submitted by Irene Oswald,
Teaching Master, Humber, N.D. Program
Humber College

93 *Vision of Basic Nursing Program Requirements in the Year 2000*
Basic Nursing Faculty Vision 2000 Committee
Humber College

94 *Hospitality Training in Hamilton-Wentworth Area*
Keith Nixon, Dean, Skills Development
Mohawk College

95 *MiniScan Submission: Continuing Education Viewpoint*
School of Continuing Education
Fanshawe College

96 *A Model for Counselling Services*
Ron Dakin, Counselling Services
Fanshawe College

97 *MiniScan Submission*
MiniScan Respondants: Nursing Faculty
Fanshawe College

98 *Vision for the Child and Youth Program*
Child and Youth Worker Program, submittted by Franceen Blidner and Arlie Fulop
Fanshawe College

99 *An Early Childhood Education Perspective*
Early Childhood Education Program, Submitted by Michael Goodmurphy, Coordinator
Fanshawe College

100 *Industrial Skills Training Committee - Vision for the Year 2000*
Industrial Skills Trg. Cmt., Submitted by Ruth Gates, V.P. Community Relations &
Gail Rozell, Adult Training Coordinator
Fanshawe College

101 *Dental Health Programs in the Future*
Dental Health Programs Advisory Committee, Submitted by Beverley Kassir, Chair
Seneca College

102 *Health Care Aide Program*
Health Care Aid Advisory Committee, Submitted by Joyce Gagnon, Chair
Sault College

103 *Role of Counselling in the Year 2000*
Ontario College Counsellors Association
Submitted by Pamela Mitchell, Chair
ACCATO Committee

104 *Conditions, Trends, Issues that will Influence the Financial Effectiveness of Ontario's Colleges . . . in the Year 2000*
College Committee on Financial & Administrative Affairs, Submitted by Robert J. Cardinali, Chair
ACAATO Committee

105 *N.I.T.A.C.'s Perception of the Role of Niagara College in the Year 2000*
Submitted by Oscar Zanatta, President & Ann Dixon Executive Mgr.
Niagara Industrial Training Advisory Corporation

106 *Problems and Opportunities for the Colleges in the Decade Ahead*
Barry Barclay, Teaching Master
Algonquin College

107 *Response to Pressures for Change - Opportunities for Development*
Anthony Tilly, Dean, Continuing Education Division
Seneca College

108 *Part-time Studies in the Year 2000*
Continuing Education Division Chairs Group, Submitted by Anthony Tilly,
Dean Continuing Education Division,
Seneca College

109 *Establishment of Centres for Job Requirements and Training Needs*
Algonquin Management Centre, Submitted by Robert Charleboise, Manager
Algonquin College

110 *The Role of Language Instruction in the Future*
English and Communications Division, Submitted by Linda Payne, Dean
Seneca College

111 *Five Issues facing the CAAT's*
Dave Darker, Hospitality Faculty
Humber College

112 *Life-Long Learning and Skills Upgrading*
Bob Scott, Faculty, Human Studies Division
Humber College

113 *Vision 2000 as Seen by the Business Advisory Committee*
Finance and Sales/General Business
Advisory Board, Submitted by Norm Lyons Chair
Sault College

114 *The College Campus in a Small Community*
Michael Delfre, Principal, Elliot Lake Campus Sault College
Sault College

115 *Colleges Linkages with other Educational Institutions*
Charlene McClintock, Secretary to Campus Principal, Elliot Lake Campus Sault College
Sault College

116 *College Placements*
Joseph Kuchma, Faculty
Sault College

117 *Sault College and the Development of Cockburn Island*
Peter Savich, Teaching Master, Computer Engineering Technology
Sault College

118 *College Health Centres & Current Trends: Special Needs*
Health Services Personnel Cmt., Submitted by Nancy Peters, Co-Chair, Sault and "Special Needs"
Appendex by Alma Stebbings, Sheridan
ACAATO Committee

119 *"Community" as the Key Word in Community College*
Mary E. Schwartz, Teaching Master, Nursing
Fanshawe College

120 *EIC Response to Framework Document*
Gunter Rochow, Senior Industrial Advisor, Labour Market Services
Employment & Immigration Canada

121 *A College Response to Radwanski: First Year of University in the Colleges, New Technology in the Classroom and Honours Diplomas*
Bill Lovsin, Faculty, Mathematics Department
Lambton College

122 *The Unknown Country (Dissertation to The Hamilton Automobile Club Feb. 1979)*
John Panabaker, Chair of the Board
Mutual Life of Canada

123 *Let's Be Flexible!*
David Chesterton, Faculty, Graphic Design
Durham College

124 *Concerns of Fanshawe College Advisory Committee for School of Business & Applied Arts*
Fanshawe Advisory Cmt., School of Business and Applied Arts, Submitted by Janet H. Stevenson, U. of Western Ontario, Chair
Fanshawe College

125 *Sheridan College Vision 2000 Faculty Workshop Submission*
Vision 2000 Faculty Workshop Participants, Submitted by Robert McElhinney, Instructional and Human Resource Development
Sheridan College

126 *Learning Resource Centres and Media Centres in the Year 2000*
Committee on Learning Resources, Submitted by Dora Dempster, Niagara Chair
ACAATO Committee

127 *Students' Basic Skills & Teacher Preparation*
Phil Irving , System Administrator
Algonquin College

128 *Comments for Colleges and the Community and Colleges and the Educational Spectrum*
Nathan Greenfield, English Faculty
Algonquin College

129 *MiniScan Submission*
Academic Council, Chairs, Associate Deans
Humber College

130 *MiniScan Composite*
Central Region Heads of Nursing, Submitted by Renée Kenny, Centennial, Chair
ACAATO Sub-committee

131 *Data Program Advisory Committee*
Data Processing Advisory Committee, Charles Whitfield, Chair
Sault College

132 *Integrated Childcare Services at Sault College*
Early Childhood Education Advisory Committee, Charles Brown, Principal Parkland School, Chair
Sault College

133 *Our Vision - The Office 2000 A.D.*
Office Administration Advisory Committee, Submitted by John C. Walker, Chair
Sault College

134 *Accounting Programs in the Colleges in the Year 2000*
Accounting Advisory Committee, Submitted by J. S. Dalgliesh, Chair
Sault College

135 *Imagine Our College : The Visioning Process at George Brown*
College Vision, Submitted by Doug Light, President
George Brown College

136 *MiniScan Submissions from Sheridan Support Staff Development Day , March 1989*
Support Staff
Sheridan College

137 *Access and Success, A Submission to Vision 2000*
College Committee on Student Affairs, Submitted by Marilyn Stratton-Zimmer, Algonquin, Chair
ACAATO Committee

138 *Confederation College Statement of Vision 2000*
Submitted by Robert Mitchelson, Vision 2000 Coordinator
Confederation College

139 *Health Care Systems Trends and Policies*
Diploma/Health Sciences Program Advisory Committee
Conestoga College

140 *College Responses to Trends and Impacts in the Next Decade*
Continuing Education Management Team, Submitted by Wendy Oliver,
Director Continuing Education
Conestoga College

141 *Science and Technology Programs in Cambrian College*
Science and Technology Division, Submitted by Linda Wilson, Vision 2000 Coordinator
Cambrian College

142 *A Vision of the Future of Community Colleges in Ontario : Responsiveness or Stability*
Academic Council, Submitted by Gaston J. Franklyn, Chair
St. Clair College

143 *Imagine the College System in the Year 2000 - A Proposal for Regional Colleges*
Ron Chopowick, Director, Academic Services
ACAATO

144 *Student Needs in the Year 2000*
Student Services Staff
École secondaire Ste-Marie

145 *Defining and Implementing a Quality Education in a Community College*
Alex Zahavich and Tom Sutton, Faculty
Mohawk College

146 *Adjustment in Funding Ratios*
Technology Academic Council, Submitted by Harold N. Atkins, Chair
Seneca College

147 *Review on the Interior Design Program at Niagara College*
Interior Design Program Advisory Committee, Submitted by J. Ronald Patrick, Coordinator
Niagara College

148 *A Vision of Seneca College and Its Nursing Program*
Nursing Program Faculty, Submitted by Katharine Janzen, Chair
Seneca College

149 *The College as an Employer*
Group of Administrators, Instructors & Counsellors, Submitted by Linda Wilson, Director of Public Affairs
Cambrian College

150 *Your College and the World Around It*
Group of Administrators, Faculty and Support Staff
Cambrian College

151 *The College and its Community*
Group of Administrators and Faculty
Cambrian College

152 *College Priorities During the Next Decade*
Group of Administrators, Faculty and Support Staff
Cambrian College

153 *Vision 2000 Your College and Its Learners*
Group of Administrators, Coordinators and an Instructor
Cambrian College

154 *Rapport - Vision 2000 journée d'études*
Organizing Committee and 90 participants of Vision 2000 Study Days, Submitted by Glenys Lafrance, Vision 2000 Coordinator
Cambrian College

155 *MiniScan Submission*
Diane Marleau, Member of Parliament
Sudbury, Ontario

156 *Mini-Sondage de Vision 2000*
Denis Haché, Vice-président académique
Cambrian College

157 *Proposal for a Structure of an Art School Within a Community College : Sheridan*
Frank Newfeld, Teaching Master, School of Visual Arts
Sheridan College

158 *Review of Your College and Its Learners*
Preparatory Studies and General Arts and Science Group, Submitted by Judith Ball, Kerina Ellitott, and Frances Painter
Conestoga College

159 *MiniScan Submission*
Associate Dean Group, Submitted by Steven Bodsworth, Chair
Humber College

160 *Nursing Accreditation: A View From Outside the Profession*
Michael Skolnik , O.I.S.E. (with input from the Central Region Heads of Nursing Programs)

161 *Social Services Worker Program /Health Care Programsat Niagara College*
Glen Brown, Chair, Niagara College Social Services Worker Program and
Gary N. Zalot, Executive Director, Niagara District Health Council

162 *Literacy and Literature for the College Student*
Frank Gavin, President English Faculty Association
Centennial College

163 *Vision 2000 - Reflection on the Possibilities for Niagara College by the Year 2000*
Port Colborne Chamber of Commerce, Community Futures Committee
Economic Development Commission, Economic Resource Centre Inc.
Submitted by Charles Salmon of Port Colborne-Wainfleet Economic Resource Centre Inc.

164 *Baccalaureate Education in Technology at Seneca College*
Technology Division Chairs, Submitted by H.N. Atkins, Dean
Seneca College

165 *Resource Centre Recommendations and Ideas*
Resource Centre Staff (17 participants of an April Vision 2000 Meeting)
Algonquin College

166 *Vision of the Library in the Year 2000*
Bernard Brégaint, Librarian
Algonquin College

167 *Suggested Improvements in Skills Development Programs*
William Finkle, Chair
Belleville C.I.T.C., Skills Quinte Inc.

168 *Literacy, Numeracy and the Nature of the Student: 2000 A.D.*
College Council, Submitted by Jack Quistwater
Sheridan College

169 *Student Entrepeneurship*
Victor Tanti and Greg Syrota, Students
Sheridan College

170 *Sources of Funding for Sheridan College*
Gary Closson, Chair, Funding Sources Focus Group
Sheridan College

171 *Double Vision*
Brian Lyons, Co-ordinator, Business Studies
Sheridan College

172 *Vision for Sheridan's Burlington Campus in the Year 2000*
Faculty of Burlington Campus, Submitted by Shirley Adams, Chair
Sheridan College

173 *Art Education in the Year 2000: From the Artist's Viewpoint*
Art, Craft and Design Study Team, Submitted by Bobbi Wagner, Teaching Master, Illustration
Sheridan College

174 *Observations on Vision 2000*
Joe Keating, Former College Teacher
J. D. Keating Associates

175 *Advocating Accessible Education Through Teacher Training*
Ted Bangay, Director, Computer and Technical Services
Sheridan College

176 *Living Well into the 21st Century*
School of Health Sciences (12 members of Ad Hoc Vision 2000 Committee
Submitted by Jeanette Linton, Chair
Conestoga College

177 *Engineering Technology Education in the Year 2000*
School of Engineering Technology Faculty, Submitted by Charles Ivey, Teaching Master
Georgian College

178 *Concerns in the Decade Ahead - Vision 2000 Focus Group Report*
Student Vision 2000 Focus Group Retreat Participants, Submitted by Danny Arcand,
Robert Lesyk and Norm Williams
Mohawk College

179 *The Future of the Ontario Community College System - An OPSEU Perspective*
Ontario Public Service Employees Union

180 *The Need for a Redesigned System of General Education in the College*
Adrian Adamson, Teaching Master
Humber College

181 *Relationships Between Colleges and Universities*
Paul Smith, Director of Planning and Staff Development
Sir Sandford Fleming College

182 *Vision on the College System in General & on Nursing Education*
Katharine Janzen, Chair, Clinical Nursing
Seneca College

183 *The Durham College Vision*
Durham College Vision, Submitted by Gary Polansky, President
Durham College

184 *Vision 2000 MiniScan Project*
Industrial Management Technology Advisory Committee, Submitted by Gerald Dunsford, Chair
Mohawk College

185 *College Council Visions for the Year 2000*
College Council Members, Submitted by Fred Ruemper, Chair
Georgian College

186 *Reporting Group: Vision 2000 ACAATO 1989*
Ron Boyce, Governor
Loyalist

187 *Proposal for a Centre of Excellence and Large-Scale Computer Integration Project*
Robin King, School of Visual Arts
Sheridan College

188 *Concepts of Importance to Vision 2000*
Norm Socha, Faculty, Daniel B. Detweiler Electrical Skills Centre
Conestoga College

189 *Predictions for Office Administration in the Year 2000*
Office Administration Department Staff, Submitted by Rose Caicco, Coordinator
Sault College

190 *MiniScan Submissions*
ACAATO Conference Vision 2000 Participants

191 *International Education and the Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts & Technology*
College Committee on International Education, Submitted by Fred Etherden, Chair
ACAATO Committee

192 *Motive Power Training*
Paul Mathewson, Motive Power Advisory Committee, & Employee Sault Transmission
Sault College

193 *Vision 2000, A Citizen's Report from Regional Niagara*
Citizens of Regional Niagara, Report prepared by George Repar, Vision 2000 Coordinator
Niagara College

194 *Focus Group Report - A Model for the College System*
International Activities Unit, Submitted by Maria Cioni, Director, RSIBA
Ministry of Colleges and Universities

195 *St. Lawrence College in the Year 2000 - Quality Education*
Nathalie Sorensen, Teaching Master
St. Lawrence College

196 *Student Services in St. Lawrence College*
Alice Dunn (Manager) and Bill Woods (Student)
St. Lawrence College

197 *Serving the Part-time Learner*
Brian Hoobin, Chair, Marketing and Continuing Education
St. Lawrence College

198 *Responding to the Needs of Gerneral Level Students*
Susan Chamberlain, Dean of Development
St. Lawrence College

199 *General Arts and Science and Vision 2000*
Robert Parkin, Teaching Master
St. Lawrence College

200 *Quality Education - A Contribution to Vision 2000*
Robert Parkin, Teaching Master
St. Lawrence College

201 *A Vision of Human Resources in the Year 2000*
Betty Boone, Human Resources Department
St. Lawrence College

202 *Vision 2000 and Special Needs Students*
Gail Easton, Teaching Master
St. Lawrence College

203 *Dreaming . . . The College in the Year 2000*
Gurjit Gill, OSDO Consultant
St. Lawrence College

204 *MiniScan Submissions*
Health Services and Human Studies Advisory Committee
St. Lawrence College

205 *MiniScan Submissions*
MiniScan Respondants: Community Members, Submitted by Robin Pepper, Vision 2000 Coordinator
St. Lawrence College

206 *College Forum Responses to MiniScan*
Campus Vision 2000 Forum Participants
St. Lawrence College

207 *Staff Responses to MiniScan*
MiniScan Respondants: College Staff (96 respondants) Summary Submitted by
Robin Pepper, Vision 2000 Coordinator
St. Lawrence College

Appendix 2: Themes and Source Index

College and College System Mandate

Themes	Boards of Governors/ Advisory Committees	Faculty	Support Staff	College Mgte.	Students & Alumni	School Boards & Universities	Community & Professional Groups
Accessibility	#26, #42 *, #56,#101, #184, #204	#25, #27,#32, #40,#52, #53, #66, #68, #99, #103, #111, #118, #123, #153, #170*, #176, #179	#42*, #66*, #68*	#42*, #58, #66*, #68*, #74*, #104, #108, #109, #137, #142*, #143, #151*, #152*	#59, #206*	#50	
Client/ Student Centered	#42*	#9, #52, #54, #59, #66*, #69, #89, #121, #123, #138, #153, #158, #165, #171, #173, #179. #200, #202	#42*, #66*	#42*, #47 #58, #65, #66 #100, #129, #137, #138, #140, #142*, #159	#42*, #92, #178, #196		#47, #55, #120, #205*

College and College System Mandate

Themes	Boards of Governors/ Advisory Committees	Faculty	Support Staff	College Mgte.	Students & Alumni	School Boards & Universities	Community Business & Professional Groups
Closer Relations with:							
Business	#23, #33, #37 #56, #67, #87 #113, #134 #204	#13, #22, #53 #70, #103 #112,#116, #117, #149, #158, #170*, #171, #172	#22*	#22*,#31* #35, #47, #65, #100, #109, #129, #138*, #142*	#59, #169*		#11, #57 #73, #78,
Community	#26, #33, #37, #67, #87, #132, #139	#8, #9,#25 #27,#39, #40, #69, #83, #99, #103, #117, #119, #128*, #141, #157	#128*	#31*, #61, #65, #76, #100, #114, #142*, #152*	#169*		#41, #71, #105, #161

College and College System Mandate

Themes	Boards of Governors/ Advisory Committees	Faculty	Support Staff	College Mgte.	Students & Alumni	School Boards & Universities	Community & Professional Groups
Closer Relations with:							
Schools	#132	#25. #49, #53, #75, #88, #89, #103, #121, #149, #158, #177	#81	#12, #15, #35, #47, #61, #65, #100, #137, #142*, #143, #150, #160, #181, #198		#50, #84	#73
Universities	#113, #132, #139	#22*, #27, #88, #89, #99, #103, #121, #141, #148, #149, #158, #176 #200	#22*, #115	#12, #22*, #31*, 35 #47,#61, #65, #100, #104, #109, #130, #142*, #143, #150, #181	#38, #59, #63, #85, #178		#163

College and College System Mandate

Themes	Boards of Governors/ Advisory Committees	Faculty	Support Staff	College Mgte.	Students & Alumni	School Boards & Universities	Community & Professional Groups
Adult Learner	#26, #67	#10,#27,#28, #42*, #62, #66, #68, #93, #96, #100, #103, #110, #112, #121, #141 #157,#172*, #179	#42*, #66*, #68*	#31*, #42*, #58, #65, #66, #68, #107, #138, #181	#42*, #59 #196		#55
Generic/ Core/ General Education/ Whole Person	#26, #56, #131, #134, #139, #161 #195	#9, #10, #13, #14, #16, #17 #22*, #53, #66*, #95, #96,#103 #106,#110, #128, #153, #158, #162, #173*, #176, #179, #180 #199, #200	#66*, #128*	#3, #7,#31* #35,#47, #51, #66 #94, #100, #104, #128, #137, #140, #142*,#143, #151, #152, #164,#168*, #181	#169		#5, #48, #55, #163
Multi-Culturalism & ESL	#113	#110, #128*, #162	#128*	#31*, #128*, #137, #140, #151			#6, #41

College and College System Mandate

Themes	Boards of Governors/ Advisory Committees	Faculty	Support Staff	College Mgte.	Students & Alumni	School Boards & Universities	Community & Professional Groups
Applied, Institutional & Educational Research		#96, #97, #106, #110, #157, #176		#15,#31, #76, #79, #104, #109, #137, #143, #150 #203	#38	#72	#5, #77, #161
Environment		#88, #106, #141, #158 #185*	#74*	#74,* #150	#44		#86, #122
Polytechnic/ Advanced Training	#37	#16, #40, #98, #99, #121, #128*, #148, #157	#128*	#35, #128*, #138*, #151, #159, #160, #164	#38		#41, #77, #105
Centres of Excellence	#26, #82, #147, #184	#1, #40, #95 #141, #157		#12, #21, #47 #61, #94, #109, #151 #187			#77, #105
Apprentice Training		#53, #170*, #192		#15, #100		#84	#73, #144

Learning Process

Themes	Boards of Governors/ Advisory Committees	Faculty	Support Staff	College Mgte.	Students & Alumni	School Boards & Universities	Community & Professional Groups
Client/ Student Centered	As Above	in Mandate	Themes	and Sources			
Flexibility	#26, #33, #42, #82 #101, #133, #139, #204	#8, #10, #19, #22, #25, #32, #40 #42, #52, #53 #66*, #68*, #70, #75, #88, #89, #92, #93, #96, #97, #99, #103 #111, #120, #123, #129 #153, #158, #159, #166 #170*, #176 #189	#19, #22*, #42*, #66*, #68*	#19*, #22, #42, #65, #66*, #68*, #104, #109, #137, #138*, #140, #142* #197, #203	#38, #42, #196, #206*	#84	#41, #78, #105, #193
Assessment	#26, #161	#88,#96,#99 #100, #103, #111, #128, #153, #158, #162, #176	#128	#31*, #65, #76, #100, #128, #137, #150	#63		#163

Learning Process

Themes	Boards of Governors/ Advisory Committees	Faculty	Support Staff	College Mgte.	Students & Alumni	School Boards & Universities	Community & Professional Groups
Preparatory/ Remedial Services	#82, #132, #147	#53, #68, #97 #110, #127, #153, #157 #158, #159 #162, #176		#7, #68*, #128*, #137, #138*, #143, #168*, #198	#63, #85 #196, #206*		#41
Curricuium Develop-ment	#37,#101, #131, #191*	#9, #10, #19 #32, #40,#54 #93, #123, #158, #162, #176, #195 #200, #202	#19	#19, #31*, #76, #94, #107, #138, #140, #142*, #143, #160	#63, #178		#57, #163
Modularized Curriculum	#26, #42*, #133, #204	#1, #13, #42 #88, #89, #93, #97 #123	#42*	#42*, #47, #89, #100, #104		#84	

Learning Process

Themes	Boards of Governors/ Advisory Committees	Faculty	Support Staff	College Mgte.	Students & Alumni	School Boards & Universities	Community & Professional Groups
Alternative Delivery Strategies/ Modes	#26,#33, #37, #101, #113, #132, #133, #134, #139 #184	#27, #28, #32 #68,#75*, #93, #99, #103, #111, #121, #128, #141, #158, #159, #165, #170*, #172* #174	#68, #74* #128*	#12, #31*, #35, #68, #74, #76, #128*, #129, #138*, #142* #151, #198 #203	#59, #169* #206*		#41, #163

College and College System Governance

Themes	Boards of Governors/ Advisory Committees	Faculty	Support Staff	College Mgte.	Students & Alumni	School Boards & Universities	Community & Professional Groups
College/ College System Governance: Participation & Autonomy	#134. #192 #204	#2, #14, #19 #25, #32, #69,#75 #88, #116, #117, #118, #119, #165, #171, #174, #177, #179 #201, #202	#19, #24, #115	#12, #18, #19, #61, #104, #107, #109, #138 #140, #143, #144, #149, #159, #181 #197	#206*	#50	#105, #163
Transfer- ability	#26, #101, #131, #132, #134, #147, #155, #204	#17, #19, #49, #62, #70, #88, #95, #99, #121, #128*, #148, #153, #165, #172*, #173*, #176 #189	#74*, #115, #128*	#74*, #79, #128*, #129, #130, #132, #150, #160, #181	#38, #63, #85, #104, #178		#71, #77

College and College System Governance

Themes	Boards of Governors/ Advisory Committees	Faculty	Support Staff	College Mgte.	Students & Alumni	School Boards & Universities	Community & Professional Groups
Standards	#23, #26 #33, #37 #102, #132, #147	#54, #66*, #75,#88*, #91,#96,#99, #127, #141, #153, #159, #162, #170*, #171, #173*, #174, #176, #177, #179	#66, #81, #115	#20, #35, #66, #79, #100, #107, #130, #160, #168*	#38,#59, #178		#78, #105, #144
Credentials	#15,#26 #131, #139 #147, #161	#40, #93, #97, #98, #100, #121, #141, #148, #174, #176		#65, #100*, #129, #159, #160, #164	#38, #178, #206*		#77, #78, #163
Image	#33, #42*, #82, #87, #139, #161	#32, #42*, #49, #93, #98,#165, #173*,#188	#42*	#31*,#35, #42*, #109, #137, #150, #151	#42*, #59, #178		#55, #105, #163

Challenges to the
College and the
College System

Background Papers

Irene Ross
Teaching Master
George Brown College

Mini Scanning the Future: A Vision 2000 Project

Study Team 4

Mini Scanning the Future:
A Vision 2000 Project

Summary

This report, based on solicited responses to four questions on a Vision 2000 mini scan regarding change and its effect on the community college system, analyzes the contributions of 698 respondents: the majority from the 22 Ontario CAATs and about 50 from several outside organizations.

The respondents identified 12 significant changes in Ontario society by the year 2000 ranging from the impact of technology to environmental issues.

In responding to the anticipated effects of these significant changes upon the colleges, the respondents make suggestions about the following: funding; governance; programming; personnel; physical and social environment; and relationships with employers, other educational jurisdictions, and the community.

To sum up, Vision 2000 is a harbinger for ongoing change, constant adaptation and elastic flexibility both within society and within the colleges.

Brève analyse de l'avenir
Projet Vision 2000

Sommaire

Ce rapport présente les résultats d'un sondage réalisé dans le cadre du projet Vision 2000. À l'aide de quatre questions, nous avons tenté de connaître l'opinion de 698 répondants, dont la plupart sont dans les 22 CAAT et une cinquantaine d'autres représentent divers organismes externes, sur les changements et leurs répercussions éventuelles sur le système collégial.

Les répondants ont identifié 12 changements importants qui surviendront au sein de la société ontarienne d'ici l'an 2000. Ces changements vont des répercussions de la technologie aux questions environnementales.

Au sujet des répercussions que ces changements importants auront sur les collèges, les suggestions des répondants se rapportent aux aspects suivants : le financement, la gestion, l'élaboration des programmes d'études, le personnel, l'environnement physique et social, les relations avec les employeurs, les autres compétences dans le domaine de l'éducation et la collectivité.

En résumé, Vision 2000 est un projet qui permet d'avoir un aperçu des changements fréquents, de l'adaptation constante et de la souplesse qui caractériseront la société et les collèges.

Table of Contents

Page

Acknowledgements
Reader's Guide
I: Introduction 1
II: A Collection of Sample Responses to Question #1 3
III: Analysis of Responses to Question #2 5
IV: A Collection of Sample Responses to Question #2 10
V: Analysis of Responses to Questions #3 and #4 19
VI: A Collection of Sample Responses to Questions #3 and #4 23
VII: Conclusions 47

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Charles Pascal and Harv Honsberger for their helpful suggestions on organizational aspects of this report.

My most sincere thanks to Mora Thompson and Catherine Clement for the visual and structural shape of this report.

I would also like to acknowledge the unnamed and anonymous Vision 2000 mini scan respondents whose views and suggestions will, no doubt, help to shape the future of the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology as we progress towards the year 2000.

Reader's Guide

In order to gain an overview of the salient information contained in the mini scans, it is necessary to read Parts I, III, V and VII.

However, the cornerstone of this report is to be found in Parts II, IV and VI, because they present actual quoted statements (slightly edited in a few instances) from the mini scans. They contain the true flavour of the thoughts, feelings, convictions, reservations, hopes, and occasionally despair expressed by those inside the Ontario community colleges and those on the outside who were also invited to share their views.

Some respondents have been with the colleges since their founding just over 20 years ago; others have joined them more recently. The responses, therefore, reflect an accumulation of insights based on varying experiences.

I. Introduction

The purpose of this report is to provide a digest of the respondents' answers to the following four questions appearing on the VISION 2000 MINI SCAN:

1. What do you think will be the most significant change in Ontario society by the year 2000?
2. What impact, if any, will this have on the college system?
3. If you could make one change to the college system in the next decade, what would it be?
4. How would this change affect the accessibility, efficiency, and quality of college training and education?

In addition to providing an overview of what was said, the report will also attempt to interpret the significance of the responses.

1 Origin of the MINISCAN

The mini scan was designed by a committee of researchers working on the VISION 2000 team charged with the task of providing the Minister of Colleges and Universities with a set of recommendations regarding the future mandate of the Ontario CAAT system. Aware of the ultimate importance of such a task, the team wanted to involve all segments of the community college population in the process: administration, faculty, support staff, and students.

Because the 22 community colleges are spread out throughout the province and the degree of familiarity with Vision 2000 varied from college to college, the team decided to use the mini scan as an icebreaker - to try to involve as quickly and as directly as possible those whom they met on their travels through the colleges.

This approach has had considerable success since it yielded close to 700 responses over a three-month period between February and May, 1989.

These responses were used to "steer" the discussion of change impacting the colleges in Study Team 4's Discussion Paper – Pressures for Change, Opportunities for Development.

2. Profile of Respondents

Vision 2000 MINI SCAN respondents included two groups: those within the college system, the vast majority; and those outside the system, under 50 in total. They comprise the following:

1. Representatives from all 22 Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology (CAATs) in these categories:
   - administration
   - faculty
   - support staff
   - students
   - union representatives
   - college board of governors representatives.
2. High school teachers from one school board and one school board trustee.
3. Members of OACETT: Ontario Association of Certified Engineering Technologists and Technicians.
4. Canada Employment Centre supervisors.

5. Several representatives from industry.
6. One assistant to an MPP.

3. Limitation of the Vision 2000 MINI SCAN Instrument

The researchers favoured an informal approach in the use of the instrument. After the fourth question, there appear two more items to be filled in:

YOUR COLLEGE ______________________

YOUR POSITION ______________________

Some respondents did provide this requested information, others left these items blank. It is, therefore, not possible to give a reliable breakdown of respondents per college nor of representation by category within a particular college.

The respondents also differed in their treatment of the mini scan. Some answered the questions briefly and quickly immediately upon request; others took the mini scans away and returned them later with carefully considered and more detailed answers.

Some respondents answered all four question; others answered some and left others blank.

Some responses to a particular question seemed more appropriate as responses to a different question on the mini scan; however, they are catalogued in this paper as presented by the respondents.

Despite these limitations, the mini scans produced a rich source of information from a crucial population sample.

4. Some Preliminary Statistics

Total number of mini scans analyzed:	698
Total number of responses to question #1: (many respondents gave more than one answer)	1237
Total number of responses to question #2 recorded here and categorized by issues identified by respondents:	232
Total number of responses recorded by category for #3:	209
Total number of responses recorded by category for #4	209

Note: The recorded number of responses represents a cross section of the issues found in the total sample. There was inevitably a similarity and repetitiveness in some of the responses found in the mini scans. Reproducing them all would not have yielded substantially new or different information.

5. Classification of responses to question # 1

Predicted significant changes in Ontario society by 2000 according to areas of change identified by respondents:

	Significant Change	No. of Responses
1.	Impact of Technology	206
2.	Aging Population	196
3.	Lifelong Learning	164
4.	Employment Variables	142
5.	Social Impact	136
6.	Immigration/Multiculturalism	106
7.	Economy	74
8.	Demographics/Birthrate	72
9.	Free Trade	47
10.	Environmental Issues	39
11.	Longevity/Leisure	30
12.	Americanization	15
	Fewer than 12 Responses	
13.	Health Issues [(Drugs (6) and AIDS (5)]	11
14.	Quality of Life (deterioration of)	9
15.	Changing Family Structure	8
16.	Women's Issues	8
17.	Growth of Ontario (effects of)	7
18.	Transportation	4
19.	Peace (2) and Natives' Rights (1)	3

II. A Collection of Sample Responses to Question #1

Representative sample responses for nine of the first twelve areas identified in the preceding classification are provided.

Impact of Technology

1. Total computerization in business and at home.
2. Technological acceleration resulting in high demand for very specialized skills.
3. Ninety percent of working people will be computer literate.
4. Skilled labourers replaced by machines.
5. There will be a shortage of technologically trained workers.

Aging Population

1. Increase in aged population.
2. Older, more diverse population.
3. Aging society; age problem.

4. Sudden workforce drop as "bulge" hits 65+.
5. Larger number of senior citizens.

Lifelong Learning

1. Continuous learning requirement in every field.
2. Greater demand for college training.
3. Need to adapt college system to new learning; i.e., part-time, mature, "on location" student.
4. Some of us will want to continue "learning" while "working".
5. The colleges will receive far more recognition from the private sector.

Employment Variables

1. Need for postsecondary education for employment.
2. There will be a shortage of teachers, skilled tradespeople, and educated people in general.
3. Frequent job/career changes.
4. Growth in financial and service area jobs.
5. Graduates will be required to have critical and analytical skills to assess the impact of their work.

Social Impact

1. The divergence of society into have's and have not's.
2. Single parent families -- often one child to an older mother -- will be the norm.
3. Reduction in middle class.
4. Greater demand for health services.
5. Strong movement back to family unit.

Immigration/Multiculturalism

1. Greater ethnic mix via Asian immigration.
2. The realignment of the still dominant W.A.S.P.-based social structure: present minorities will become majorities.
3. People mix: age, race, culture.
4. A more cosmopolitan society.
5. Immigrants will play a larger role in forming society's rules and values.

Economy

1. Economic integration with the U.S. influencing agricultural and manufacturing production.
2. Major economic constraints due to problems with the ecosystem; hence, lower material standard of living.
3. Government deficits.
4. Two income families.

5. Competition in a global economy: trading blocs, multinationals, not Ontario-based; politics follows economy.

Free Trade

1. Implementation of the agreement.
2. More entrepreneurism resulting from free trade.
3. Increased unemployment of low skilled employees.
4. Highly competitive industries because of free trade.
5. For whatever reasons, the Free Trade Agreement will require the development of an integrated economic environment in North America.

Environmental Issues

1. Preoccupation with environmental issues: planetary survival.
2. Density concerns for living and working.
3. Environmental concerns vs. employment opportunities.
4. The banning of sprays to save the ozone layer.
5. Critical issues: environmental concerns and energy conservation.

III. Analysis of Responses to Question #2

What follows is a listing of issues found in responses to Question #2 and organized under classification titles established for responses to Question #1.

1. Technology: Impact on College System

Of the 232 randomly culled responses, 37 dealt with issues of technology.

The respondents indicated that technology would have an impact upon the college system in a number of areas and in various ways, among them:

- type of personnel in colleges
- equipment costs
- admission standards
- political climate
- technical literacy
- higher specialization
- increased enrollment
- upgrading of standards
- colleges' ability to provide sufficient trained workers
- teaching thinking skills
- spread technological awareness to community
- longer training

- frequent re-entry
- need to be on leading edge

Implications: Need to examine issues of funding, qualifications of personnel, governance, liaison with employers and contact with the community.

2. Aging Population: Impact on College System

Of the 232 randomly culled responses, 32 dealt with issues of the aging population.

According to the respondents, the aging population would have an impact on the colleges as follows:

- reduction of student numbers
- retirees returning to college
- need for courses re: elderly
- students - more knowledgeable/experienced
- courses re: services for seniors
- fewer full time post-secondary courses
- decrease in traditional daytime delivery
- more interfaces between work/education
- higher medical costs/less money for college
- retraining for part-time secondary careers
- major percentage of teachers retiring
- more interaction - younger/older students

Implications: Need to address potential curriculum revisions, delivery modes, teacher training, bridging of generation gap.

3. Impact on College System: Lifelong Learning

Of the 232 randomly selected responses, 51 dealt with issues of lifelong learning/ education.

The respondents offered the following observations regarding its impact on the colleges:

- increase in college enrollment
- constant upgrading of skills
- provision for handicapped students
- increased flexibility/shorter courses
- provision for mature students
- demand for more specialized courses
- need for improved quality of teaching
- demand for both credit and non-credit courses
- need to recognize achievements in work force
- more language and literacy training

- interactive modes of delivery
- more co-op programs because of equipment costs
- less need for college buildings
- more learning via telecommunications
- articulation demanded - portability, transferability, milestone credentials
- need courses to address changing work/leisure society
- facilities to accommodate 24 to 65 year-olds instead of 18 to 24 year-olds

Implications: Need to look at design of facilities; credits for life and work experience; proliferation of course offerings.

4. Employment Variables: Impact on College System

Of the 232 culled random responses, 35 dealt with issues regarding employment variables and their impact on the college system:

- more students training for service jobs in tourism and hospitality
- more updating of trades courses needed
- pressure to produce better qualified workforce
- more colleges more accessible to the masses
- automation will release more workers for retraining in the daytime
- automation requiring fewer highly trained people will reduce number of students
- more training for building trades, home industry required
- need to teach basics more productively
- pressure to escape "low pay" sector will increase enrollment in well-paid sector courses
- need to prepare workforce for transition of skill needs
- job mobility will create challenge re: retention
- some programs will run intermittently on demand

Implications: Need for increased flexibility around a fluid, ever changing employment scenario.

5. Social Issues: Impact on College System

Of the 232 randomly noted responses, 22 identified issues of social impact upon the college system:

- difficulties re: affordable accommodation in Toronto
- increase in allied health professions/occupations
- poor getting poorer will decrease number of students
- increase in social problems affecting attendance/performance
- increased demand for access
- increased demand for financial assistance
- less government assistance funding for students
- needs to redesign facilities to meet client needs: child care facilities; off campus locations

Implications: College personnel will need increased awareness/ training to respond to social issues and problems among college student populations of the future.

6. Immigration/Multiculturalism: Impact on College System

Of the 232 recorded responses, 18 dealt with the influences of immigration/multiculturalism on the college system:

- requirements for smaller class size
- increase in special needs students
- greater funding difficulties for northern colleges to meet full range of needs
- adapt curriculum to needs of diverse society
- special training for flexibility/ adaptability in workplace and beyond
- more need for response to individual rather than mass market expectations
- increased demand for ESL and related programs in larger centres
- students with more severe academic deficiencies
- assist population to deal with multiculturalism

Implications: Added focus on multicultural sensitivity for personnel and in college curriculum.

7. Global Economy: Impact on College System

There were 9 responses among the 232 dealing with economic issues and their impact on the college system:

- colleges must adapt and respond quickly as business/industry prepare to compete on global scale
- need to keep the technology balance in our program mix if industry to remain a world competitor
- a tremendous demand for upgrading and also high level technology transfer education/training
- jobs will change - need to understand international forces
- less emphasis on "JOB" training and more towards educating for adjustment to change

Implications: Need for colleges to lead as well as to respond; consequently, visionary leadership in the college system.

8. Demographics/Birth Rate: Impact on College System

There were four responses; three of them follow:

- competition for bodies may result in lowering of admission standards
- fewer students: result of lower birthrate
- growing population in Ontario will strain college resources

9. Free Trade: Impact on College System

There were 9 responses addressing issues of free trade among the 232 culled responses:

- will have to address policies/ philosophy regarding influence of free trade
- more jobs move off shore to lower pay areas
- fewer moderately paid jobs available for our graduates
- if funding mechanisms expanded to compensate for jobs lost through Free Trade, an increase in student numbers (retraining) and in female student population

Implications: Need to identify vulnerable industries and plan retraining accordingly.

10. Environmental Issues: Impact on College System

There were 6 responses on this topic (among 232 responses):

- reduction in funding for education as a result of funding for environmental issues
- perhaps enhance interest in and grants for natural resource programs
- need to understand how to manage environment

11. Longevity/Leisure: Impact on College System

There were 5 responses altogether:

- people need programs/courses on how to deal with increased leisure time
- increase in leisure services
- increase in part-time teachers and social courses

12. Americanization: Impact on College System

Total of 2 responses:

- It will stress service professions/trades instead of development or research types
- many students will look into American education

13. Women, Family, etc.

Total of 3 responses; one follows:

- Lack of mobility due to out-of-school responsibilities

14. Metro Concentration

- Because of Toronto-centred population concentration, northwestern and northeastern areas will need to plan around this phenomenon.

IV. A Collection of Sample Responses to Question #2

The following is a collection of 232 responses to the question about the impact on the colleges of previously cited significant changes by the year 2000. They are organized under the same titles as those found in Part III.

1. TECHNOLOGY

Equipment Issues

1. Need for up-to-date equipment; expect greater initial costs plus costs for upkeep.
2. More equipment will be required as well as more instructors who will have to keep up with new breakthroughs.
3. A requirement to specialize more highly and have more quality training aids.
4. The Colleges should purchase enough micro-computers and/or computer terminals so that every student can use computers for word processing, spread sheets, desk top publishing, data bases accounting, CADCAM, special occupational uses, etc., so that they are as comfortable with them when they graduate as they are now with calculators and typewriters.

Training Issues

5. More learning from computer disk, and student to student.
6. More need for technical personnel; less need for "arts" graduates.
7. More computer-centered teaching; possibly fewer mistakes.
8. The college system has to grow to prepare individuals to cope with the technological explosion such as computer assisted learning, preparation of professional schools, i.e., nursing at the Bachelor's level, and designing courses for seniors.
9. The college system will be required to continue to create innovative programs and allow students the opportunity to experiment freely and develop creatively.
10. Need to train people to be flexible and ready and able to retrain.
11. Technical literacy must become a compulsory course for all students in our intermediate division: boys, girls, ESL adults. (A high school teacher's comments)
12. Greater emphasis on high-tech knowledge, coupled with a need for effective management courses (latter must retain humanities along with economics, etc.) (Director, Publications & Communications, OACETT)
13. There will be an increase in the number of graduates needed in various areas of computer design, use and implementation. Pre-computer age graduates will require retraining or updated training to allow them to integrate into the working world.
14. Special technical training will be taken away from colleges or directly controlled by industry. More courses on study skills, career planning, public speaking, writing, etc., should be provided.
15. Business and industry will demand more "How To" training courses (Low level). We must, however, insist on an increasing education component to extend (slow down) the retraining cycle.
16. Integrating computers into classes that presently do not use them.
17. Need for longer training and more frequent re-entry into system for ongoing education.
18. Students, as well as teachers, will have to become much more knowledgeable in computer use.

19. More courses will be available to fit new jobs.

Issues of Currency and Quality

20. Higher pre-requisites for college entry.
21. Major impact - colleges will have to keep up with technological advances.
22. There will be a need to expand the technology or high-tech studies. The colleges will be subjected to more political pressure and, therefore, will be in danger of losing their independence. (High school teacher's comment).
23. Greatly enhance the province-wide sagging enrollment at all colleges with obvious increased revenue, but also and more importantly "Excellence in Education and Research"!
24. Colleges will be forced to upgrade their graduation standards and consequently the future of Ontario.
25. Standardization across the system, possibly. Each college is able to address each of the areas as it interprets the need, very often to suit "current" local practices and market conditions without any regard for the future.
26. I believe the college must make all the courses more interesting to future students.
27. Colleges currently not keeping up with demand for technical workers and updating skills for existing workforce.
28. College system will have to be related directly to needs of both society and the industries which will support society.
29. We cannot see ourselves as dealers of wisdom/knowledge for students to consume. We must see ourselves as teachers of (1) thinking (2) management of information and people; must encourage self-assessment by the student.
30. Colleges will have to increase technological needs awareness in their communities.
31. More application of computer technology in the workplace. Some changes already in place.
32. More necessity for students to partake in this change. More teaching abilities from teachers (knowledge). (Student)
33. New fields of concentration will have to be introduced to satisfy the learning community; e.g., the field of computer science will be as broad as the math field.
34. The need to be on the leading edge of the technology and to keep up with the changes.
35. The college system must graduate people who are highly competent and automatically qualified for membership in their respective technical body.

2. AGING POPULATION

1. May reduce number of students in college system.
2. Adults may return for general education after retiring.
3. Problems of supporting older population will affect all of us.
4. Reflux of generalization vs. specialized programs.
5. Focus must change drastically to accommodate mature population: those who wish to or must re-educate themselves.
6. Will deplete our pension sources.
7. Need courses dealing with the elderly.
8. Broader clientele: more experience and content/knowledge.

9. In order to keep enrollment up - need courses to appeal to older segment while training younger segment in services required by seniors.
10. Perhaps the colleges should cater to the older population along with other groups:
    a. Using the expertise of the retired tradesman
    b. Retraining early retirees
11. More opportunities for older people to enroll in courses on a part-time basis or to take courses by correspondence.
12. We will have to adapt to training a mature audience and training existing industry staff through trades updating or face severe reduction in student numbers.
13. Fewer full-time post secondary courses.
14. Increase in health training.
15. Increase in adult learning.
16. Decrease in traditional daytime delivery.
17. Significant impact - may require a major rethinking of the way we operate.
18. Costs of medical care will likely put more pressure on provincial budgets and colleges and universities will get squeezed again (and more).
19. If the college system wants to survive, it will have to cater to mature students.
20. Need more part-time course systems - more flexibility and consideration of the interfaces between work/education.
21. Need to reform teaching/learning methods.
22. Major percentage of teachers will be retiring.
23. Need college programs to meet health and social needs of the aging population with an emphasis on health promotion and self-care.
24. The college system will have a greater demand put on the nursing program... because society will need more nurses. (Student)
25. More interaction between younger and older people at college.
26. The gerontology programs will need to be increased. (Student)
27. Many will look to colleges for assistance in planning for and coping with their retirement: a need for enrichment and interest subjects - a retraining for part-time secondary careers.
28. We must work to retrain older workers.
29. The system will have to accommodate programs that will educate people to look after our aging population.
30. I feel this will increase emphasis on adult learning and programs specifically geared for adults.
31. A need for accredited training for more health care aides to relieve the health care professionals and assist in their work with the disabled and elderly.
32. Older population taking courses full or part-time.

3. LIFELONG LEARNING

Student Needs

1. Increased flexibility, shorter courses.
2. More hands-on training needed.

3. More language and literacy training.
4. Will have to focus more on the needs of adult learners returning to school or on work release to upgrade skills.
5. Less need for college buildings.
6. The college system will have to become more sensitive to needs and perceptions of students. Quality should become the talisman of the system - quality at all levels of management with a focus on education as a dialogue process.
7. College must specialize.
8. National set standards for diplomas will have to be established and colleges have to be bound by them.
9. Short term (1 year) certified courses have to be introduced with option for a specialization course of 2 years with diploma.
10. We must be able to accept a student at any level and build from that point to required skill level.
11. Increased need for curriculum to be developed in the field of aging.
12. Increased non-traditional education courses-programs packaging. Articulation demanded - milestone credentials, portability, transferability, laddering; private sector or U.S. will do it.
13. The college system has to keep the RNA and the RN diploma program. We are going to need more nurses in the year 2000. If all nurses must have their degree by the year 2000, society is going to suffer, because there will not be enough nurses for our aging population.
14. The colleges should plan for a shift in the main thrust of their course offerings, i.e., courses and programs dealing with health care for the "healthy elderly", as well as for the infirm, retirement planning, sociology of aging, helping children to deal with aging parents, etc., and small business courses and services.
15. Courses should include related components and programs should include sociology and other courses to address the needs of changing (work/leisure) society.
16. Links with industry in order to remain up-to-date.
17. Constant upgrading of skills.
18. Provision for handicapped and mature students.
19. Demand for both credit and non-credit courses.
20. Recognize achievements in workforce.
21. Family breadwinner cannot afford to spend three years in school with summer off. Shorter time spent in school.
22. We need to change our recruitment efforts and how we deal with students once we receive more mature students.
23. Improve quality of teaching; reduce confusion in the workplace.

Projections

24. Increase in college enrollment.
25. Students' demand for quality education.
26. Demand for more specialized courses.
27. Realization by college population of importance of further education - motivation.
28. Significant attention to type of program and method of teaching.

29. People will be dropping in and out of education system.

30. It will cause enrollment to double.

31. Increase in vocational teaching techniques and delivery systems - interactive modes of delivery.

32. Increased co-op programs because of equipment costs and upgrading.

33. Development of life-enrichment programs.

34. Development of college resource knowledge centres.

35. Increase in part-time learners accessing traditional full-time studies.

36. Accessibility.

37. "Cross-fertilization" with other institutions.

38. If colleges continue upgrading programs, the enrollment should rise due to the poor job that the high schools are doing.

39. More learning will be done remotely via telecommunications and satellite.

40. There will be a drop in the quality of education.

41. More people will go to college rather than university because of the shorter time factor. (Student)

42. The classroom setting will become increasingly specialized instead of the norm. Learning and instruction will be possible in alternate settings.

43. Demand for elected positions on boards of governors with financial participation from all three levels of government.

44. There will be no community college Nursing programs and as such there will be further shortage of nursing professionals. Because not all people can afford a university education, enrollment would be reduced due to financial strain. (Student)

45. All disciplines/faculties will be forced to work together. Companies/individuals will more directly influence retraining of individuals. People will have several careers, retraining at college. Facilities will be forced to accommodate 24-65-year rather than 18-24-year age group.

4. EMPLOYMENT VARIABLES

1. More students attending college courses in tourism and food service.

2. Changing profile of students from high school grads to adult dislocated workers.

3. Loss of jobs due to economic fluctuations.

4. More updating of trades courses needed.

5. The colleges will be expected to produce people who can think. However, the type of student who is entering the college system, on the whole, is one who cannot think or, in some cases, will not think on his own. However, the special programs which try to teach students to think are about to be "axed" by the government. Therefore, the situation is one of dramatic irony.

6. Pressure to produce better qualified workforce.

7. Make colleges more accessible to the masses.

8. A much higher percentage of the population will want to get a college education (both instead of university and as a career training move after a university degree). Only doctors, lawyers, and Indian chiefs won't have to go to college to be employable.

9. Colleges will have to train technicians to service equipment used by service industries.

10. As a result of flexible work schedules via automation, more daytime hours available for upgrading individual education, i.e., enrollment will go up.

11. Automation, resulting in the requirement of few but highly trained people, will no doubt reduce the number of students in colleges.

12. College system will be seen as being expensive. Will have to supply more trained personnel to fill in the gaps in the workplace.

13. More pressure for skills that are of a hands-on nature, i.e., building trades, home industry.

14. Discover how to teach the basics and still increase productivity.

15. The constant pressure to escape the "low pay" sector will cause an increased enrollment in courses or programmes which will provide entry into the shrinking well-paid sector.

16. More short term complete programs for the adult learner; i.e., weeks rather than months.

17. Ability to bridge from college to university.

18. Job mobility will create a real challenge with respect to retention.

19. Need to prepare workforce for transition of skill needs.

20. Demand for retraining.

21. Communication skills and the ability to evaluate information critically will be essential.

22. Possibly more progress related to service industries and retraining.

23. Possibly more retraining and short programs. This will make it necessary to spend much more time and funds in retraining the teaching staff first.

24. Some programs will have to run irregularly according to demand.

25. Faculty will have to be flexible to teach a variety of programs within one year and between years.

26. College programs must be sensitive to the fact that our finished product, the graduate, will have to be:

    a). Technically competent; i.e., environment challenges
    b). Service oriented - in order to meet the demands of the graying population.

27. Bearing in mind that in any given company one engineer can design something but it takes many technicians to make it, do you aim for the one or the many?

28. Colleges might go out of business because people will just go straight to work instead of continuing their education. (Student)

29. A lot more women will be seeking career-oriented courses.

30. Teaching future employees to contribute to "work teams".

31. The colleges will be flooded with people who want to better themselves and earn a better living.

32. Minority people may seek higher standards and enter into the college system.

33. Increased need for adult retraining.

34. The colleges should place much more emphasis on retraining and upgrading so that declining enrollment will be somewhat offset by increased recruitment of adult students. This will also help narrow the gap between the surplus of unskilled labour, technicians, technologists, etc.

5. SOCIAL IMPACT

Societal Needs

1. Training of people to meet health and home care needs.
2. The college system will have to or should begin to look at providing affordable education to the have-nots.
3. The facilities will have to be designed to serve the needs of various types of students (child care buildings, off campus locations, etc.)
4. Increase in allied health professions and occupations.
5. This system will have to be in tune with future requirements of "society" which will provide for a better "fit" of qualification of their graduates to the jobs which will be there at their time of graduation.
6. Many more special interest groups will be requesting college resources. Insightful planning using all college human resources and rapid response to society's needs will be necessary.
7. College will need to rationalize activities against three mechanisms:
   - a) economic development
   - b) social policy actions by government; e.g., human rights, etc.
   - c) demands for competent andragogy wherever teaching and learning may occur.
8. Depending on the direction of senior governments, the colleges will become either institutions for the privileged and gifted or temporary holding (with some skills training) vessels for the working class.

Projections

9. It will become more difficult for students to find affordable accommodation while studying in Toronto.
10. The poor getting poorer will result in a decrease in number of students.
11. The burdens on individuals will be heavy. Colleges will have limited government funds and will also be expected to deliver many different training programs.
12. More clients will have social problems that will affect their attendance and performance in the education system.
13. More people will want education and training to become competitive in the job market.
14. Fewer people with middle class values; therefore, fewer people interested in advanced education; therefore, reduced college funding is justified.
15. Higher tuition fees. (Student)
16. Increased demand for access to system; increased demand for financial assistance.
17. Funding will be directed to health services.
18. Most students will not receive government funding for education; financing for colleges from governments will be down.
19. Lower literacy and preparation levels; higher expectations.
20. Less monies available.
21. Less respect for the teacher; respect only for the rich.
22. College funds will decrease and OSAP regulations will become even more ludicrous and unfair.

6. IMMIGRATION/MULTICULTURALISM

1. Requirement for smaller class size.
2. Increase in special needs students.
3. Great difficulty in northern colleges to be funded and offer the full range of needed programs to meet their area's needs.
4. We need to determine how we must educate this "mass" to make society productive.
5. It will force colleges to water down some of their programs to meet "everybody's needs."
6. Change emphasis of programs and the integration of cultures.
7. Adapt curriculum to needs of a more diverse society — tolerance.
8. Graduates must be trained to respond flexibly and effectively to many different kinds of people and approaches - both in the workplace and in life generally.
9. More time and energy, on an ongoing basis, will be required in responding to individual expectations, rather than the mass market.
10. Faculty, staff and administrators will be forced to become flexible in course delivery, sensitive to non-dominant needs and held accountable for developing interpersonal sensitivity and skills well above present standards.
11. We will have to be able to cope with the varying entry level skills of students into our various programs if we are to retain them over some of the 2 and 3 year programs.
12. I feel the college system should be a leader in preparing the communities it serves by providing and promoting information programs which will help Ontario society understand and accept its newest members with a minimum of resentment and/or fear.
13. Greater demand for more rapid development and adaptation of programs to truly address current and future needs of employers.
14. Increased demand for ESL and related courses/programs for immigrants in Toronto and other large centres.
15. We must help our population cope with multiculturalism.
16. We can expect a more diverse student body with more varied goals and in many cases, more severe academic deficiencies.
17. Our courses virtually have to be geared to viable subjects that students want and that get them jobs.
18. They will need ESL and cultural orientation.

7. GLOBAL ECONOMY

1. The college system will have to adapt and be able to respond quickly to the demands of industry and business as they gear to compete on a global scale.
2. The colleges could either (1) champion the educational needs of a massively alienated permanent "underclass" which constitutes a growing group of citizens or (2) "rationalize" to serve the shrinking needs of the corporations for certain skills. (3) The colleges may commit suicide by internalizing corporate practices and ideology without reference to their real status as public institutions.
3. The college system will go belly up and speaking of bellies there will be a lot of hungry ones. We'll be so busy eating each other we won't have time to think about higher education. Colleges of applied arts and technology will disappear: no jobs for students to go to, no tax dollars to fund them.

4. Needed is a change in the quality and understanding of those entering the college.
5. The Colleges are moving towards service/communication programs as experienced by the tremendous growth of Applied Arts programs in the last decade. We need to keep the technology balance in our program mix if industry is to keep competitive world-wide.
6. A tremendous demand for upgrading and also high level technology transfer education/training.
7. Jobs will change — need to understand international forces.
8. A wider and deeper content with less emphasis on "JOB" training and more towards educating for adjustment to change. The college system consequently would be more sensitive to the needs of SOCIETY.
9. The colleges will be in a more difficult position. There will be severe restrictions on the operating budgets of the colleges at a time when the market demands will be for courses that will be expensive to deliver.

8. DEMOGRAPHICS/BIRTHRATE

1. High competition for bodies to fill the college system may result in the lowering of admission standards.
2. Metro Toronto colleges: static, if not decreased, enrollment. Other colleges in southern Ontario: Increased population in communities outside of Toronto (especially along Windsor-Montreal corridor).
3. Fewer students: result of lower birthrate.
4. The growing population in Ontario will have an impact on the college systems: possible overcrowding or courses not available because of population growth.

9. FREE TRADE

1. More jobs move off shore to lower pay areas. Fewer jobs that have moderate pay for our graduates.
2. Education may become more expensive as government budget cuts and budget cutbacks in OSAP cause individual student price rise.
3. Government will likely lose a considerable amount of money due to the deal.
4. Many more technologists will be required by industry; and American technologists will work more freely in Ontario; i.e., U.S.A./CAN college systems will require coordination.
5. Because of increased demand for technicians and technologists to allow competition in Free Trade environment, expansion in relevant programs should be starting now.
6. Will have to address policies/philosophy regarding influence of free trade.
7. If funding mechanisms are expanded to compensate for jobs lost through Free Trade - an increase in student numbers (retraining) and an increase in female student population.
8. The agreement will make schools in the States more accessible and desirable. The Ontario schools will have to compete.
9. System will have to be more reactive/proactive/responsive to its student and corporate community.

10. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

1. Ways to improve the environment will need to be created. The creative mind then becomes a hot commodity requiring an abundance of technical support.

2. Necessity of including in the programmes segments of education regarding long-term, universal impact of technology.
3. Jobs will change - need to understand how to manage the environment.
4. Reduction in funding.
5. Will have to stress the importance of the ecology in the education system. Perhaps enhance interests in natural resource programs and grants. (Student)
6. More technical expertise will be required in the research and development and production of alternate technologies to meet the demands of the more environmentally and energy conscious society.

11. LONGEVITY/LEISURE

1. Leisure time is increasing and people need assistance to deal with this: programs, courses.
2. Need to respond to increased P.T. student activity, career counselling, etc., and the offering of courses (retirement preparation, leisure time courses, operating small business).
3. Programs will change - will be more slanted toward leisure activities.
4. Increase in leisure services.
5. Increase in part-time teachers and social courses.

12. AMERICANIZATION

1. It will stress service type professions/trades; not development or research types.
2. Many students will look into American education.

13. WOMEN, FAMILY, ETC.

1. The need for broader options for training/study re: type delivery, time lines. Meet the needs of the market.
2. Increased enrollment in full-time and part-time studies.
3. Lack of mobility by this group due to out-of-school responsibilities.

14. METRO CONCENTRATION

With heavy population centred in areas close to Toronto, planning to serve northwestern and northeastern Ontario will need strategic planning.

V. Analysis of Responses to Questions #3 and #4

The questions are:

3. If you could make one change to the College system in the next decade, what would it be?
4. How would this change affect the accessibility, efficiency and quality of College training and education?

The responses to these two questions were organized under the headings derived from respondents' significant change predictions in response to question #1. See list of headings on p. 7.

However, the proportion of responses by category to questions #3 and #4 differs from the proportion for #1 and #2. Whereas technology and the aging population were the two areas selected by the largest number of respondents as the most significant potential manifestations of change by the year 2000, proposals for change by the same respondents stressed activities under the headings of Lifelong Learning, Employment Variables and the Economy.

The suggestions for change found in responses to questions #3 and #4 do not directly relate to the answers in questions #1 and #2. Nevertheless, it was felt that it would be preferable to continue using the same titles throughout rather than inventing new, possibly more precise, ones because shifting to a new set of titles would have resulted in unnecessary confusion.

What follows is a capsulized selection of respondents' suggestions along with their predictions as to outcomes/results.

Technology

Of the 209 culled responses, 13 suggestions for change were related to technology. These included:

- procuring more computers
- more funding to update outdated equipment
- teachers from industry with up-to-date skills
- providing computer courses for the community

The predicted outcomes (results):

- increased accessibility, efficiency and quality
- enhancement of colleges' image as a high quality trainer
- more marketable graduates with up-to-date skills
- potentially strained efficiency by the increase in numbers of students

Aging Population

There were 13 suggestions among the 209 culled responses on how to deal with the aging population. Some suggestions:

- adapting the system to the mature student from the working world
- assessing life experience and removing "second class" label from adult learners
- more programs for older adults with below standard education
- making more funding available to mature students
- getting rid of MSD and moving to a system more sympathetic to the adult learner
- giving older College staff an incentive to leave and providing opportunities for new staff who have a lot to offer

Predicted outcomes:

- would make it easier for mature learners to gain admission with advanced standing based on work experience
- would require organizational as well as psychological change on the part of the College system

- easier to update existing skills
- having funding in place for adults instead of spending time trying to find funds would aid efficiency and accessibility

Lifelong Learning

There were 63 suggestions out of 209 relating to lifelong learning/education. Some of these are:

- going to voucher system in post secondary education
- opening up the system more to part-time learners and non-traditional modes of education
- revamping provincial/federal legislative relationship to allow legitimate federal presence in education at all levels
- changing learning/teaching styles - more stress on adult education learning principles
- greater emphasis on transferable skills (e.g. problem solving)
- clarifying the position of credits in the system -- into and from -- academic institutions and business and industrial community
- defining mandate: school boards, universities, colleges
- amalgamating MSD and MCU
- getting every company/industry to subscribe to day release lifetime learning for all employees

Predicted outcomes:

- colleges would be efficient, relevant, and highly specific -- occupation competence geared
- tie together financial, political and educational leadership
- colleges would have to be much more proactive in their aims and delivery
- would enhance the image and place the system in public perception as addressing real and specific needs in the continuum of education

Employment Variables

Of the 209 recorded responses, 58 stressed employment related suggestions such as:

- making administrative positions in the college system desirable to the most talented and able in order to encourage them to apply
- encouraging faculty to remain professionally current
- instituting evaluation for all college employees
- hiring world class educators as C.E.O.'s and administrators
- strengthening faculty teaching skills
- incorporating co-op programs for students on a much larger scale
- paying students for work experience components of programs
- establishing closer links between colleges and industry
- increasing federal and provincial funding of colleges
- making all operations of the colleges more democratic

Predicted outcomes include:

- more competent decision making
- recognition of the fact that colleges are educational institutions, not businesses
- better team work
- increased quality of classroom education
- better performance in the workplace by college graduates

Social Issues

Among the 209 responses, there were 15 suggestions relating to social issues:

- generous day care arrangements for the benefit of the students
- student residences
- enforcing personal and professional standards of conduct
- opening up the colleges to all disadvantaged groups currently left out

The following results are foreseen:

- greater accessibility
- a system with a heightened level of social consciousness

Immigration/Multiculturalism

Among the responses there were five suggestions on this topic of which two are presented below:

- developing an international approach in order to capitalize on opportunities in the international marketplace
- involving visible minorities in decision making and delivering of education

Projected outcomes:

- quality training and education
- increased enrollment

Economy/Funding

There were 35 suggestions among the 209 relating to economic/funding issues including these:

- revising funding procedures to allow unspent money allocated to a department to be "saved for a rainy day" instead of having to resort to panic spending prior to an artificially defined deadline
- increased funding -- putting a stop to underfunding of colleges
- allowing colleges to seek equity position in ventures with industry just as universities are allowed to do
- changing the funding mechanisms so programs are not penalized for taking part-time students

- developing a more flexible funding system to accommodate varying priorities and creative ingenuities of specific college communities
- enough funding to afford up-to-date equipment

Predicted outcomes:

- less stress and better productivity
- better quality of service to community
- instead of being driven to behave according to funding dictates, colleges could respond to diverse needs of small client groups

The remaining categories with fewer statements — Demographics, Free Trade and Environmental Issues — were not capsulized. They can be read in Part VI in their original version.

VI. A Collection of Sample Responses to Questions #3 and #4

Because these two questions were interdependent, the 209 representative responses from the total sample of 698 are shown side by side . Again they are grouped under the previously identified title classifications.

Some groupings with numerous responses have also been organized under subheadings in order to highlight certain issues more clearly.

TECHNOLOGY

EQUIPMENT ISSUES

	Suggestion		*Result*
1.	A touring committee to look at the upgrading of equipment in all existing programs.	1.	Up-to-date equipment would at least offer an aura of professionalism to programs.
2.	Have one computer available for every three students.	2.	Would help prepare every student for the "real world" and make them more employable.
3.	Increased computer upgrading and availability for all programs.	3.	Would improve it.
4a.	Provide a college satellite with all colleges having ability to both transmit and receive. Hence, link "Socrates by satellite."	4a.	Greater access to scarce resource; more sharing.
4b.	Acknowledge that faculty (discipline) development can easily by facilitated by putting latest technical equipment in colleges.	4b.	Reduces other and often more expensive means of funding.
5.	More new equipment to keep up with technology. Teachers from the industry with recent knowledge to enhance the learning process.	5.	Increased accessibility, efficiency and quality.

6.	Provide the most modern technical equipment available to train people for the current scene.	6.	It would make all the difference in the world.
7.	Provide enough funding for colleges to update their outdated equipment.	7.	Would allow students to graduate with updated skills and make them more marketable in the business world and enhance colleges' image as a high quality trainer.

PEOPLE ISSUES

	Suggestion		***Result***
8.	Everyone in the system should become computer literate.	8.	Computer Assisted Learning enhances students' self-directed learning capabilities. The high-tech explosion forces students to incorporate computers into their working as well as their personal life.
9.	I would change the image. Currently it's seen as a glorified high school and looked down upon by university communities. (Student)	9.	If colleges are updated regarding technological advancements, the quality of education will (or should) increase accordingly.
10.	Increase access to the college not only for the students but also for the community wishing to catch up and keep caught up with today's technology.	10.	The quality of training would be enhanced through feedback from a broader crosscut of society. Efficiency might be strained by the increase in numbers of students.
11.	Change the attitude which says, "Let's teach advanced hi-tech computerized theory" and substitute an attitude which says, "Let's teach bricklaying."	11.	This change would bring college training more in line with its mandate of "Applied Arts & Technology" and supply industry with a workforce capable of "applying" skills. It may also help to answer the question, "Now that we all have our Ph.D., who is going to lay the bricks?"
12.	Re-establish the need for technological-management training at the college and other levels.	12.	Upgrading of facilities, equipment and expertise.
13.	Introduce alternate modes of learning for greater flexibility: auto-instructional methods, distance learning, interactive videodisc, resource based learning, media based learning, computer based learning, short courses, etc.	13.	Instruction more adapted to individual learner. Instruction more effective and more efficient (faster) through individualized systems.

AGING POPULATION

	Suggestion		*Result*
1.	Assess life experience, remove "second class" label of adult learners — acknowledge all learning within community college.	1.	• increase accessibility • streamline efficiency • with constant diligence improve and safeguard quality of education and promote lifelong learning.
2.	Increase flexibility to respond to changes in the population and their needs.	2.	Very positive. Without it, the very existence of the public college is in question.
3.	Make system more responsive to the needs of a changing society.	3.	The priorities would take a shift to the older worker and focus on quality of life. The funding system of colleges would have to change.
4.	Admit retired students who have the time and money to pursue whatever they wish to do.	4.	Because of the lowering of the retirement age, people are going to look for training for leisure activities or to start their own businesses. Retirement isn't for all.
5.	More programs for older people whose past education isn't up to standard any more.	5.	It would improve quality by getting the views and knowledge of the older generation.
6.	Funding available to mature students — more opportunities such as Transitions.	6.	Easier for mature learner to gain admission with advanced standing based on work experience. Update existing skills.
7.	Increase variety of courses offered in night school and on Saturday and Sunday. Students with years of experience deserve to be treated not as students but as improving adults.	7.	Also those teaching the course should be qualified professionals, not the likes of some of the "teachers" our college retains. If you sign up for night school today, chances are you may not learn much.
8.	Adapt the system to the mature student from the working world instead of the full-time high school graduate.	8.	The "pro" — assist the learner and adapt to his lifestyle. The "con" — would require organizational change as well as psychological change on the part of the employer.
9.	Encourage early retirement for staff to allow the younger and more updated employees to remain. Most layoffs involve newer staff who have a lot to offer. Give older staff an incentive to leave.		
10.	Get rid of MSD. Move to system that is more sympathetic to adult learner.	10.	We are moving toward an increased sensitivity to our role in education of the employed adult. It would be nice to have funding in place for adults. Now we spend half our time finding out where the money is.

11.	All courses offered part-time.	11.	More access to those working while learning. Quality will continue to be good if development of teachers becomes a priority.
12.	Have the college system allow me to retire early. I am weary of the constant need to adapt to the stranger and his needs. I was born just before 1940, so have experienced immigration wave after immigration wave. There has never been a "settling down" time in my lifetime, where assimilation of values could occur.		
13.	Offer more to older population. Work on recruiting all ages.	13.	Encourage and support single parents and career changes. Also allow aging teachers to stay on longer.

LIFELONG LEARNING

STUDENT ISSUES

	Suggestion		*Result*
1.	Change college focus and climate: develop programs and services to meet student needs.	1.	The more flexible we become re: student needs/wants, the higher the chances of student/community satisfaction; therefore, survival.
2.	Improve access of academically underprepared students through developmental/remedial education and appropriate counselling.	2.	This would improve retention of students.
3.	More flexibility for students. Break down programs. Increase use of language in all curriculum.	3.	More student based; more connection between learning, student and life.
4.	With the tendency for technology to impact on learning system, people focus should be increased.	4.	Flexible hours for smaller groupings. Administration would serve rather than dictate the process.
5.	Change learning/teaching styles — less lecture style, more stress on adult education learning principles.	5.	Accessibility, efficiency — small groups keen to learn because they are older.
6.	Implement and incorporate communications program for every student.	6.	Would ready students for any area of expertise.
7.	That it really centres around the client and doesn't pay lip service.	7.	Students/clients would have a sincere part in the direction and natural growth of colleges.
8.	Prepare students better for college level before entering them into a post-secondary program. Do we need more upgrading and remedial courses?	8.	Accessibility, efficiency and quality will definitely improve.
9.	Develop a truly adult education philosophy approach where faculty, staff and students practise this approach.	9.	This would increase the range and types of students accessing programs from upgrading to post-university or returning professionals. The self-directed learning approach for faculty and students is self-evident.
10.	More learning. The system is too slack. It doesn't motivate students to go to school. (Student)	10.	It should make the college more or "the same" as the universities in terms of education.
11.	Be more responsive to critical education of students rather than skills training for business and industry only.	11.	Quality will increase with education complementing skills; accessibility depends on funding; efficiency has to be defined in other than dollar terms.
12.	More emphasis on peer tutoring and counselling.	12.	This should enhance training and education components.

LINKAGE ISSUES

	Suggestion		*Result*
13.	Better integration with secondary system (re: student preparation) and universities (re: transfers in both directions).	13.	Improve all three systems.
14.	Improved integration with and marketing to the high school system.	14.	Programs and high school requirements would mesh for an easy flow from one to the other.
15.	Rationalization which includes portability of qualifications and the province-wide setting of exams and standards in closer co-operation with professional bodies.	15.	Colleges must be sold as a distinctive career path alternative to universities. Consequently, changes are necessary to the secondary school system; e.g., greater redefined emphasis on Science and Technology.
16.	Increase depth and quality of programs through a mandate for 4th year.	16.	Positive effect. We currently compress 4 years of education/training into 3. This does not allow slow-to-low-average students to plug in and grow. They fail and drop out. They lose and we lose.
17.	Better link between colleges and universities.	17.	It would promote professional and educational growth of individuals in their various fields.
18.	Make colleges as degree granting institutions similar to Ryerson Polytechnical Institute.	18.	This would enable the nursing profession to meet its goal of baccalaureate entry to practise by the year 2000.
19.	Get both more out in the field work as well as setting higher theoretical levels. Put the educational level close to that offered by a degree from university.	19.	Quality higher; accessibility decreased. Would put a strain on those coming back for retraining who would have a lot to catch up on.
20.	Linkages/partnerships with Ministry of Education and university systems.	20.	All three would be impacted.
21.	Clarify the position of credits in the system — into and from — academic institutions and business and industrial community.	21.	Enhance the image and place the system in the public perception as addressing real and specific needs in a continuum of education.
22.	Loosen up structure through funding; course-based? Define mandate: school boards; universities; colleges.	22.	Flexibility leads to access, improvement and relevance.
23.	At present colleges compete with universities for students. Transferability of college credits would attract greater response from graduating high school students.	23.	This would ensure that the quality of college education is not compromised.

24.	To provide a well-defined place in the continuum of education from elementary through secondary to tertiary education. Colleges need to fit and need to be seen to fit.	24.	The links necessary to create the continuum would increase our quality, define accessibility and streamline the educational process across the college.

MANAGEMENT ISSUES

	Suggestion		*Result*
25.	Develop process for human resource management.	25.	Innovative programs and teaching will improve the quality of life and education.
26.	Discard standard programming • offer full-time/part-time study options • adjust funding to compensate for above.	26.	It would allow students/community to access college services on a "needs" basis.
27.	Lead — not only respond — to change.	27.	We must become more proficient keepers of the faith (of universal enlightenment).
28.	Improve system's academic respectability.	28.	Accessibility might be restricted, but then attrition would be reduced and retention increased. Quality would improve. College education would be more closely linked to other institutions.
29.	Resources available twelve months of the year.	29.	Increase accessibility as not as many prerequisites required.
30.	• 12 month/year operation • 24 hours/day (a total package)	30.	Accessibility — great! But efficiency and quality will only be a result of institutional will and there must be stimulus to create this will, other than fear of unemployment.
31.	Have the system run by educators rather than accountants.	31.	Education would be more accessible, less efficient, more expensive but more of an educational experience and less a training experience. This would result in graduates less in need of retraining in five years.

CONTENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES

	Suggestion		*Result*
32.	More significance on retraining and skills development as jobs become redundant. More emphasis on lifelong learning.	32.	More versatile programs regarding entry time and class time. Open door policy with directions.
33.	Parallel system of recognition for understanding of content and process of delivery.	33.	Recognize that teaching is not learning — that knowing how to deliver content does not of itself justify content.
34.	Stress basic adult literacy skills — reading, writing, math and computing skills — at a high functional level. Look at Singapore — they have learned from our college system.	34.	Increased accessibility and efficiency if people have the basic skills and do not drop out, but stay and finish their programs.

35.	Rationalize centres of excellence and no degrees.	35.	Positive.
36.	Revamp provincial/federal legislative relationship to allow a legitimate federal presence in education at all levels.	36.	Tie together financial, political and educational leadership.
37.	Go to voucher system in post-secondary education. Every citizen would have an equal (free) chance (once in a lifetime) to access programs of choice.	37.	Colleges would have to be efficient, relevant and highly specific (occupation competence geared).
38.	Open up the system more to part-time learners and non-traditional modes of education. Requires federal and provincial commitment to support these activities.	38.	Accessibility would be significantly enhanced. The quality of a system adapted to the learner would be significantly higher.
39.	Greater emphasis on transferable skills (e.g., problem solving).	39.	Colleges would have to be much more proactive in their aims and delivery.
40.	I would like to see this Vision 2000 assist in giving some stability to the system. Constant change/crisis management has been occurring since I came to the College. Change is good/necessary but not to this extent.	40.	Quality time would then be spent on the development of programs/training which would better serve the community.
41.	Move to specialization; do away with non-effective programs.	41.	Would reduce accessibility somewhat, but would greatly increase efficiency and quality of education.
42.	A - Better community integration; B - Better literacy training (standard, business and technical literacy).	42.	The system must be more efficient and provide more access over a longer period of time for every individual.
43.	I would give real rather than lip service to the general education components. We have produced superbly trained grads who fit their tech niche, but know very little about their history/culture/world.	43.	An educated person not only knows how to learn at any age ... but sees the value of lifelong learning on a full- or part-time basis and is more willing to make the sacrifice of personal leisure time and $$ to seek it.
44.	Have colleges that specialize in certain fields — less of a generalist emphasis.	44.	Accessibility — most students travel to attend college anyway (little change); efficiency as a system will increase; quality will increase.
45.	Modularize and decentralize the learning process.	45.	Greater accessibility and overall improvement of learning of courses once modularized can be matched to learning styles.
46.	Introduce clearly articulated admission standards.	46.	Students would be accepted into appropriate levels which would insure student success. Programs can concentrate on developing high quality courses which will attract more students and lead to more demand for graduates.

47.	Define or redefine the mission of the college system in terms of graduate characteristics for the benefit of students and employers and community.	47.	It would tend to make the community more directly accountable for the effectiveness and efficiency of college training with ample prescribed criteria for measurement.
48.	Get every company/industry to subscribe to day release, lifetime learning for all its employees. Plus training for leisure, fun and self-employment in senior years and prior to.	48.	Accessibility would be there for everyone. Quality and efficiency through numbers being catered to.
49.	Colleges should be huge resource centres.	49.	Could have end of session exam for quality control (written and oral and hands-on as necessary).
50.	Increase specialization of colleges in system.	50.	Decrease accessibility. Each college cannot do everything. Increase in efficiency, quality.
51.	Increase the accessibility and attractiveness of college programs with an emphasis on problem solving in a general orientation.	51.	Might produce graduates who have flexibility in meeting the challenges of tomorrow.
52.	More emphasis should be placed on communication courses in the college system. (A technology student)	52.	College graduates would have better communication skills.
53.	Involvement with industrial retraining on a continuous basis.	53.	We must be able to tailor programs for individual students and their specific goals and time requirements.
54.	Perhaps less emphasis on general arts humanities courses as an end in themselves.	54.	Hopefully quality of training would more closely resemble the world in the 21st century.
55.	Introduce an independent inspection system with departmental examinations at least for part of the marks.	55.	There are long-term and short-term objectives. I am concerned about what other countries are doing. No take-home true/false tests in Japan!
56.	Amalgamation of MSD and MCU.	56.	Allow students to continue studies or mix different approaches.
57.	Ministry of Education/Colleges and Universities and Skills Development organized under one. Revamp funding system.	57.	More fluidity for student progression. Allows for better funding.
58.	Stream programs: 1) CEGEP model to university 2) Degree granting 3) Basic training certificate/diploma.	58.	Crystallize college role in a multi-dimensional educational environment. Do not privatize education.
59.	Credit for knowledge or skills learned outside the classroom. Non-traditional degrees.	59.	Not all learning would take place in the classroom. Educators would become facilitators.
60.	Focus on creativity and artistic thinking.	60.	Don't know.

61.	Change colleges from a crown corporation with its own act to a private institution like the university system.	61.	Reduce limitations to scope of activities. Funding should remain about the same. Develop centres of excellence. Consolidate programs in specific colleges.
62.	Increased use of "on-the-job" training combined with college education.	62.	Should make courses more attractive to students. Cost of education could be reduced. Quality of education would increase.
63.	All teachers be certified teachers or have ten years of experience in their field. (Student)	63.	Better quality of education.
64.	The teachers.	64.	If the teachers were more open and unbiased, the learning would improve and there would be fewer dropouts and less stress. (Student)

EMPLOYMENT VARIABLES

ADMINISTRATION, FACULTY, UNION ISSUES

	Suggestion		***Result***
1.	I would like to see the introduction of a model incorporating vertical accountability. All line and staff advisory positions should be term appointments (2-5 years). These should be drawn from within the college and after a pre-determined period, each person must return to classroom as faculty. The Pres., etc., should teach while in office and should expect to return to classroom upon completion of term of office. In keeping with the concept, faculty must return to industry every five years. If seniority rules the roost, such a program will force faculty to remain "au courant," not lame ducks.	1.	Would increase efficiency and quality of college training and education. Would possibly make the system more vibrant because of the constant change it would encourage.
2.	Equalization of faculty responsibilities across college system. Requirement of a review of faculty's seniority in terms of tenure every 5 years to ensure they remain up-to-date.	2.	There would be a greater sense of equality among faculty and less political infighting, would ensure up-to-date faculty at all times.
3.	The influence of teachers is so important that a better matching of teachers' abilities and students' needs is needed. Portable pensions and help in finding more appropriate positions for unsuitable people should be a legal requirement so there is less pain for individuals who move out of education work.	3.	It would improve the system in all respects.
4.	Set up a true rotation system and try to remove or reduce the adversarial admin/faculty problem.	4.	Better teamwork would be possible.
5.	All staff should be evaluated annually. Incompetent and outdated instructors/ instruction should be weeded out. Inefficient administrators and poor teaching masters would be retrained or eliminated.	5.	Tremendous cost savings • rationalization of programs and courses • downsizing of system replacing it with new initiatives and current technologies.
6.	Enforce a ruling that staff devote themselves to their duties rather than to some other money-making commitment.	6.	Students are currently aware of this divided interest, and in many cases suffer as a result.
7.	Strengthen the professional faculty skills, especially in the areas of classroom teaching, evaluation and curriculum development.	7.	Such a change with concurrent and related changes in administrative practices would have little effect on accessibility, considerable effect on system efficiency and effectiveness, and would greatly improve the quality of college training and education.

8.	Recoup the Academic Collective agreement, specifically whole issue of working hours.	8.	Allow needed flexibility and continuity in program and course length, scheduling, delivery mode, etc.
9.	I'd get rid of "dead wood", some unnecessary administrators, and then I'd hire more teachers, especially competent teachers. More full-time staff are needed. Sessional instructors just don't care in the same way.	9.	Students would get quality instruction from experts ... The people in authority should be allowed to use that authority to make sure the students get what they need.
10.	Set up a genuinely collegial system so that faculty can have some input into how the place is run before it all comes to a halt.	10.	Give me a break. This is all a bad joke. Don't ask faculty unless you are prepared to give us some power to shape the educational process or structure the institution, etc.
11.	Have management manage and let faculty teach.	11.	Increase quality education in the classroom. Managers would be accountable for their actions or lack of same.
12.	Create an authoritative advisory commission.	12.	This must be maintained with no shortcomings.
13.	To have faculty really answer student concerns and demands and have administration enforce demands for change.	13.	By eliminating the ineffective instructor.
14.	The environment between union management. Union activists need to be better informed as to what salaries and benefits can be expected for certain skills and appreciate that those dollars come from the taxpayer. Clear goal setting on behalf of faculty to expend their non-contact time productively. (Support staff)	14.	It would (could) create a positive environment for staff if they are aware of what are reasonable or unreasonable expectations. This would affect the students' attitudes as well. In summary — there must be some things which are positive about our environment at the college. Let's not lose sight of them!
15.	Strengthen the quality of the teaching and student learning process; i.e., provide all college teachers with the essential skills to impart crucial and relevant "Learning to Learn" techniques as they apply to each offering.	15.	This change would go a long way to address the alarming student learning frustrations experienced at present which will lead to even higher student dropouts in the next decade and ultimately will result in critical skill shortages in particular in technology. I would be pleased to clarify any of the above.
16.	Reorganize the management of the colleges so that information and ideas could travel upward as well as they can travel downward.	16.	All would be enhanced.
17.	Stop promoting people beyond their level of competence. Incorporate innovative, fresh approaches in PR.	17.	Give the community a real view of its college. People would feel a part of (share in).
18.	Decrease bureaucracy — more teacher centered. Stop reinvention of wheel, duplication of services.		

19.	Demand excellent management. This means you have to increase management salaries considerably to attract competent people. Fire poor performers. (A teaching master)	19.	If Ontario is going to maintain its current position, the colleges need to become a lot more efficient. We should place much less emphasis on "glamour" courses and a lot more on basics.
20.	Replace poorly qualified instructors so we can connect more efficiently with the universities.	20.	• Improve the training quality • Make university more accessible to those who left high school early.
21.	Better utilization of qualified teachers on the front line by: 1) Support systems: admission diagnostics, counselling, library and media resources, better utilization of support staff for faculty. 2) Collaboration and cooperation with the administration.	21.	Quality will be enhanced only if monitored and adjusted accordingly.
22.	Every faculty member will work 1/3 at classroom instruction, 1/3 at their vocation or specialty, and 1/3 at internship monitoring their students as they perform in the workplace AT NO COST TO THE EMPLOYER. (Teaching Master, 19 years)	22.	A return to more self-discipline for students and full accountability for instructors (cost-effective) will result in a lean and mean efficient system ... which currently it is NOT.
23.	Insist on quality — at all levels of the college including administration and support staff ... Our students should not only be prepared to enter the workplace, but also to further their education.	23.	College training would be quality training the way it was always meant to be for the widest number of people.
24.	Make it attractive for the most competent people to seek administrative positions. At the moment it seems the people who gravitate to these positions are those who are insecure in their jobs as teachers or whose ego needs demand a lot of gratification.	24.	More competent decision making with regard to coping with attrition, student behavioral and academic standards, the allocation of scarce resources.
25.	Hire world class educators as C.E.O.'s and administrators.	25.	They would understand that colleges are educational institutions, not businesses.
26.	Develop deans and chairs who can demonstrate leadership, new ideas, new programs, challenge by comparison with private industry (particularly U.S. and Japanese companies). At present, they are all bureaucrats concerned with a bottom line of more of the same.	26.	Leadership from deans and chairs would inspire teachers to lead students — provide a more exciting and flexible learning environment. The business community is also evolving. They want problem solvers, risk takers, team players, people with a broad flexible education.
27.	Make all operations of the colleges more democratic. Evaluation of supervisors and managers. Managers should do some teaching.	27.	More democracy leading to higher morale and more staff and student willingness to market the college.
28.	To have teachers show up for their classes and do their job.	28.	The students might enjoy going to college and learning something.

29a.	Ensure that teachers are there because they are interested in teaching and not just there for the money and long holidays as most seem to be at the moment. (Student)		
29b.	Stronger staff development for better teaching skills and set qualification standards for teaching masters.	29b.	The quality of graduating students would be better.

STUDENT TRAINING ISSUES

	Suggestion		*Result*
30.	More programs where graduates actually gain a skill (employable) — focus on trades.	30.	Different focus, different clients, meet market needs, fill a community need.
31.	Pay students for practical work in some way, paralleling the co-op system in universities in which students are paid for placement work.	31.	By improving accessibility it would raise the morale and motivation of the students.
32.	Have more "Hands On" experience available to students so when they complete a course, employers can't say: "You have no experience."		
33.	I would place more emphasis on "on-the-job" training in colleges. There should be some type of incentive for students to take a co-operative program seriously. Therefore, payment of some sort should be involved.		
34.	Gear programs to realistic preparation for the workforce by training them on equipment that is reasonably current with that used in industry.	34.	This would make the student a better "packageable" product to industry. Currently, many students leave college with the basic background knowledge, but in order to go on in industry must pursue further training at their own expense.
35.	Provide more co-op programs so that a) the student can gain experience and b) the students can assess if their career choice is right for them.	35.	It would produce knowledgeable, experienced workers and would reflect favourably on the colleges. It would increase efficiency within the system.
36.	Provide a more employment-related curriculum. Individuals need more preparation in employment skills in order to compete and succeed in the rapidly changing labour market.	36.	Better training and better performance in the workplace.
37.	a) Obtain funding to assist slow learners in finding jobs — as well as others who are currently not employable. b) Train those students for the positions they can fill.	37.	a) Education is now accessible; however, employment is not. b) For low level students, we offer a very inefficient system now. c) Quality would improve 500%.

38.	Extend the co-operative education applications.	38.	• Free up space (semester in - semester out) • Improve "real" world access to and from college advisory boards • Faculty in tune • Encourage reverse-business
39.	Bring students up to entry skills required and refuse to lower standards. Co-operate with industry to identify needs. Participatory management all around.	39.	To deliver efficient high quality and relevant instruction, overall participatory management needed: industry, community, faculty and administration should join in to serve students and shape the institution.
40.	Link industry with delivery of programs; i.e., project and product development, delivery of information, co-op experience.	40.	a) Funds from industry can assist students and colleges. b) Graduate relates to the industry by gaining experience during his/her studies. c) Faculty upgrades skills with involvement in the industry.
41.	Flexible enough to handle a "walk-in, walk-out" clientele.	41.	• Hold quality as a "constant" • Set parameters for efficiency (incl. funding) • Accessibility would be improved
42.	A more student-oriented environment. Administration has its hands in too many aspects of the student's life. Since students pay, they should have more say. (Student)	42.	Colleges would become more attractive to prospective students.
43.	Seriously commit to literacy. Also to low tech programs, which while lacking in glamour, will always fill a need.	43.	All would be increased.
44.	Raise admission standards.	44.	Efficiency - produce grads who would be more productive in society. Quality - more time would be spent in job related training than in remedial English, Math, etc.

ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES

	Suggestion		*Result*
45.	I would like to see funding geared to job placement.	45.	It should apply market forces to the provision of all these attributes — those who provide them are rewarded, those who do not are penalized.
46.	Utilize facilities year round. Involve industry to greater extent.	46.	a) Longer course hours — number of hours per day, shorter time frame — number of days. b) Make available short programs to update all workers on routine basis.
47.	Break down the traditional "world of the college" — run courses in company facilities, in community facilities, etc.	47.	Traditional constraints on accessibility must expand to include other life experiences those experienced in industry bring with them.

48.	Move toward the community around us. Reach out to bring all people who seek the education we can provide into the college or send teachers out to reach the people where they work and live.	48.	Accessibility would increase. Efficiency as judged now would decline. Quality (if you have good teachers) will increase as we will have to build programs/courses which meet the consumers' needs.
49.	I would like to change the colleges' image. Some employers tend to choose university grads versus college grads. I would like to see steps taken to eliminate this. The level of education in these institutions is different, but the graduates are skilled people. (Student)	49.	Destroying the negative image will increase the number of students coming from high school.
50.	Greater co-operation and specialization between and in the colleges.	50.	More students will come from the workforce; hence, the way programs are offered is critical.
51.	A more positive local image based on feedback from both students and staff in the college system.	51.	Would arouse interest in college offerings and perhaps appeal to a broader community base.
52.	Greater emphasis on value creation in the workplace. How will Ontario workers (including management, etc.) be able to compete on an equal footing with similar groups from New York, California, Japan, Germany, etc.?	52.	More emphasis on value creation might give greater efficiency. If quality of college training is related to meaningful job opportunity, it should be enhanced.
53.	Ensure the colleges are flexible in their delivery. Cannot afford to lost training opportunities to numerous aggressive private sector trainers.	53.	By staying current and reactive to change, colleges will not only stay accessible, but will deliver relevant training to a new workforce.
54.	Re-evaluate program requirements to keep up with the changes in society.	54.	Improve efficiency and quality and better prepare students for the work world.
55.	We need to recruit more aggressively and to become more entrepreneurial in dealing with training needs of business and industry. We should shorten delivery time in proposal development. We need to become more market driven and less institutionalized.	55.	Efficiency would improve if management was better trained, more proactive and market driven. New markets would open up, particularly in the area of corporate delivery of training, adult training and retraining.
56.	The first change I can think of is: the political system. Politics should play no role in colleges. Senior management must be creative, innovative and not money driven. It is a major and ultimate change to be undertaken by the provincial government.	56.	By eliminating the political virus from the college body, the needy departments will easily be recognized as will the faculty/staff, the kernel of any college rather than the people who have the final decision-making "privilege".
57.	Improved forecasting to determine employment needs/opportunities.	57.	Efficiency only as good as ability to realistically perceive demands.
58.	Increase status of women in all areas: employment, socialization.	58.	Would greatly change the education of women and men.

59. More women principals. Female president. Flexible learning hours. Flexible working hours.

SOCIAL ISSUES

	Suggestion		***Result***
1.	Awareness of educational needs of lower economic level community.	1.	More accessibility.
2.	Institute mutual understanding training for faculty and students. Learn how to deal with encroaching drugs and violence. Demographic change.	2.	It would streamline adjustment of ever more prevalent groups to "Canadian" expectations.
3.	Make colleges multiply but remain small and personal with multiple course offerings.	3.	Great improvement.
4.	Increase federal and provincial funding of colleges.	4.	This would make the colleges more accessible and improve quality.
5.	Cater in a bigger way to all populations, i.e., retraining of the adult learner, basic level as well as special needs populations — open access and university transition programs.	5.	Improved access and quality.
6.	No fees, provide living stipend.	6.	Accessibility, efficiency, quality. Would enhance faculty commitment to college, increase involvement of currently "denied" students; might also democratize decision making.
7.	Reinvigorate the Canadian studies focus in its many facets: government and politics, sociology, economy, public issues, etc.	7.	Develop the human qualities and understandings needed in dealing with people and a diverse society community.
8.	I would have a daycare centre available with generous hours for students with children. This would also benefit students taking child care courses. At present outside daycare centres are open till 5 p.m. One of my classes runs until 6:30 p.m. and I have to miss it.	8.	The students in child care programs would be able to gain practical experience.
9.	All colleges should provide residence for out-of-town students.	9.	It would take a lot of the burden off students and parents.
10.	To move into the forefront with training methods and equipment rather than lag behind industry. Develop a more efficient routing of our students from kindergarten on.	10.	College training would match the social and industrial needs thereby providing efficiency.
11.	Attitudes of people (teachers/admin./ staff) — whatever their position, people tend to forget we are here for the students.	11.	Graduates would leave with a positive attitude and with a higher quality of education.

12.	Complete honesty and justice within the system. Esprit de corps, courtesy, helpfulness, co-operation as described and advocated by Dr. John Roueche.	12.	Would vastly improve the system.
13.	I believe we have been too permissive in our value systems — to accommodate students. We need to enforce personal and professional standards of conduct more than we have.	13.	It would develop graduates who are more concerned about the needs of others instead of their own rights. It would decrease accessibility to those wishing to use the CAATs for selfish reasons and increase attractiveness of the CAATs to those motivated to serve society's needs.
14.	Open up the college system to serve the needs of visible minorities, the learning disabled, women, the labour movement and all disadvantaged groups. At present we are an elitist system.	14.	At present, the emphasis is on EFFICIENCY. This business-oriented approach excludes many from the community. Presently we don't serve the community, but rather one sector only (business and employers).
15.	Quicker response to changing needs of society with adequate retraining and updating for college staff.	15.	Positively.
16.	Massive increase in government funded child care facility at each college.	16.	Students would be motivated to meet our educational objectives. Attendance requirement would be dropped from most courses.
17.	Need to make changes in the physical plant: more elevators, ramps, etc.		
18.	Include more classes of a recreational or interest type. (Student)		

IMMIGRATION - MULTICULTURALISM

	Suggestion		***Result***
1.	Although the college system should be responsive to the needs of the community, the system must not become ethnocentric; but must take on an international approach for the growing multicultural community and the need to be ready for the international market.	1.	In theory this should help with providing the educational requirements of the multicultural community. If we look ahead to world stage and are providing education that is compatible to that state then the college system is providing quality training and education.
2.	That faculty become aware of other cultures and that they be tolerant and accepting of other cultures.	2.	It would mean that more students would have access and quality education would be enhanced.
3.	Involve the visible minorities in the decision-making and delivering of education.	3.	Would increase accessibility first which would in turn make the college system more efficient in its original mandate.
4.	Better financing! Greater emphasis on cultural literacy, citizenship.	4.	Achieve basic citizen raising.
5.	I would like to add more socio-cultural awareness through seminars and courses for staff, faculty, students. We are becoming more of a multicultural society. Not a viable option to exclude those who are not like the dominant culture. The inverse would be more racism and sexism.	5.	Initially there would be additional cost involved. However, the gain through increased enrollment from previously unreached groups as well as more VISA students would make up the difference.

ECONOMY

FUNDING ISSUES

	Suggestion		*Result*
1.	Increase responsiveness by providing incentives such as current year funding.	1.	This would have a positive impact.
2.	Funding — don't punish a department for not spending all their money. If only $80,000 of $100,000 was spent, they should get the $20,000 for emergency use instead of blowing $20,000 just to meet the budget year end.	2.	More and better equipment and/or books could be bought with the extra money. Less stress on staff to watch budget — makes for better working conditions and happier students.
3.	Stop the underfunding of the colleges.	3.	Would allow for more capital equipment which would enhance the quality of education. Would allow college faculty to broaden their scope in terms of professional development.
4.	Increased funding and increased generic skills (general education).	4.	Increased quality of education, more accessibility, better education/training.
5.	Obtain better funding so that program hours do not get butchered.	5.	This would maintain quality of existing programs.
6.	Allow colleges to seek equity position in ventures with industry just as universities are now permitted to set up venture capital entities.	6.	My specific project for Sault College would be permitted. The successful implementation of the project would realize more students attending this college because of "excellence" status in natural resources studies.
7.	A change in the funding mechanisms so programs are not penalized for taking P.T. students and P.T. students are not penalized for not taking a full course load when they are trying to acquire a new career plus balance their responsibilities.	7.	It would make courses and programs more accessible to the population.
8.	Increase in funding and change in the funding system to allow smaller colleges to offer a range of courses.		
9.	The way resources are allocated. The funding mechanism drives the system. Develop a system that serves or at least accommodates the alternative priorities of different communities and supports the creative ingenuity we demonstrate in meeting such needs. (College president)	9.	It would let us meet the diverse needs of small client groups in a variety of structures rather than create structures to maximize funding. We could employ more effective and responsive structures to meet needs.
10.	Update the archaic OSAP system, which binds students to full-time course loads and in turn puts archaic limits on the admission and program delivery process.	10.	Would allow economically disadvantaged or special needs students greater likelihood of success at their own pace. Would maximize the resources.

11.	Change the outmoded approach to funding and acknowledge that the traditional 2-or-3-year program of full-time studying is no longer viable. Fund part-time more appropriately.	11.	Would improve accessibility and open colleges to a new generation of students. Resources could be used more efficiently; staff would have practical development through a greater variety of programs and could be encouraged to find new methods of presentation.
12.	College system should have a clear-cut mandate — clear-cut profiles of graduates — and to achieve this colleges should have enough funding to teach students properly.	12.	In technology: labs and facilities are expensive and we can only train a small number of students per lab session. Government should be aware of this. It means that education will be quite costly but we have to compete against other countries. It might take 4 years to teach/train a technician/technologist.
13.	Funding methods reassessed • faculty/teacher roles revised: professional development offered; • flexibility.	13.	More students but not in traditional pictures.
14.	Vision 2000 could be vehicle to influence leadership at the top to help us "cut through the red tape and put $$ into system." Premier's Council is saying "Put $$ into rising stars."	14.	... would "open up" the college system, make it more flexible, specific, high calibre, responsive, an institution of the future ... and our future is global, not regional or national.
15.	An end to rigid bureaucratic and funding structures; e.g., post-secondary vs. non post-secondary.	15.	The colleges would be freer to respond to genuine need for training and education and to stop responding to needs which no longer exist.
16.	Align the college system with the business sector to become more self-sufficient and less dependent upon government funding.	16.	A lean, efficient system would allow for greater attention to retention and marketing.
17.	Funding: Ontario needs skilled trade workers but won't fund.	17.	If fully funded programs leading to employment were offered, enrollment would rise, unemployment and welfare would decrease. Put money up front; not after the fact.
18.	Enough funds to be able to purchase the latest equipment. Lack of funding is one of the saddest phenomena the last few years. Investment in our youth would be a wise investment.	18.	College training would be quality training.
19.	Streamline funding structures which would allow smoother movement of students between remedial/developmental programs and skill/vocational training/post-secondary programs.	19.	Greater accessibility to developmental/remedial programs would increase retention rates.
20.	More money.	20.	Better advertising, better teachers, more professional development, good results in community.

RESOURCE & MANAGEMENT ISSUES

	Suggestion		*Result*
21.	A greater degree of flexibility in course selection.	21.	It hopefully will allow individual colleges to react quickly to local market interests and demands.
22.	Open door policy for all Ontario citizens 24 hours a day, 365 days a year — multi-tiered levels of certification and diplomas, credit courses on T.V.	22.	Focus the education dollars to established colleges and universities and withdraw the funds for "training" from employers. The available funds are fragmented, inadequate and very thin for the existing system.
23.	In order to survive, we will need to generalize more and specialize only in rare areas.	23.	More efficient, more accessible, but quality would drop.
24.	More emphasis on program rationalization — duplication of efforts self-destructive.	24.	Efficiency and quality improvement, and through distance education accessibility could be maintained.
25.	The one change that I would make is that students should get free lunches and free parking during work experience. (Student)	25.	It would change the efficiency and quality of college training because the student wouldn't starve during lunch and therefore perform better.
26.	To ensure that the system is rationalized to permit only the delivery of world class programs where necessary to be competitive and community based programs where the standard is local.	26.	• Less accessibility (all colleges cannot offer all programs) • Greater efficiency • Higher quality and more importantly, higher effectiveness.
27.	Lobby the Minister of Education to make the colleges the sole proprietor of adult education in the province and prevent the duplication and competition between school boards that depletes resources.	27.	We need to stop splitting the education dollar on duplication.
28.	Have job placement or clinical areas pay for work done by students. (Diploma nursing student)	28.	This would decrease need for subsidy and increase enrollment by lowering costs. Also it would make enrollment more feasible for mature students.
29.	More collaboration between colleges and universities. Authority to grant associate degrees in some programs; i.e., nursing.	29.	Would increase quality and provide more options for students; i.e., Art and Art History programs at Erindale and Sheridan.
30.	I would like to introduce training through the armed forces and other government programs.	30.	If implemented and maintained properly, this change would improve the functions of the college by giving more people the chance to learn many new skills.
31.	Increase quality and have Americans come to Ontario for education.	31.	More funding.

32.	Reduce total number of colleges by 40%.	32.	It would slightly reduce accessibility to some market segments initially. However, money would be freed up to creatively address distance education and accessibility in the long run.
33.	Colleges can and must use allocated resources more efficiently and effectively. Lots of room for this.		
34.	In the short term, the colleges should continue to look for alternative funding sources. In the longer term, the colleges should look for methods to reduce the development and delivery costs for courses.	34.	The colleges are looking at innovative teaching methods, but they are not developing any of these themselves. They are not innovative or co-operative amongst themselves. The idea of duplication of facilities and competition is destructive.
35.	With business and industry develop programs on "day release" from work.	35.	a) Increase accessibility to training especially for ESL students in service industries. b) Colleges might be able to reach more students especially if business and industry agree to share in the cost of day release programs and pay students to attend. c) Quality should be unaffected.
36.	Make the required texts for programs less expensive.	36.	Students would buy the books.
37.	Try to limit tuition increases. Try to limit prices of books.	37.	More accessible for people who may not be able to afford to go to large cities.
38.	Fair access to loan funds (OSAP, etc.) for the married/mature student population.	38.	Education accessible to mature candidates who have had time to realize what they want from life and are in general more dedicated to their education.
39.	We always (since about 1980) seem to be living in poverty and frankly, I'm sick of it. I don't know whether it's actually because of under-funding or because of inefficiency of management. Frankly, I suspect both ... The college funding formula is ridiculous and inequitable.	39.	Decreased accessibility to some programs.

DEMOGRAPHICS - BIRTHRATE

Suggestion	*Result*
1. Community awareness — products (services) must be designed to meet the needs of community demographics — scope and vision of targeted population.	1. • Unlimited accessibility — 24 hours • Contract teaching • Co-operative education in various forms • Private sector sponsorship for current equipment in a world of fast-changing technology.
2. Focus needs to be client-centered. Demographics taken into account — would help to give the kind of education required.	2. Would improve effectiveness.

FREE TRADE

Suggestion	*Result*
1. Greater focus on retraining particularly because of free trade and shortage of skilled workers.	1a. Alternating night and day classes to accommodate shift workers for retraining. 1b. Offering many continuous learning courses through the day when seniors are more comfortable attending.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Suggestion	*Result*
1. Education to expand people's awareness of themselves, their fellows and their environment.	
2. Ensure that all students and employees are environmentally aware.	2. Improvements in all areas where a leadership role is undertaken by the colleges.
3. Provide all students with sufficient education to enable them to analyze their environment, so that they are able to decide what is best for them. Do not "make them the tools" but "given them the tools."	
4. Introduce new programs and courses and/or orient existing courses toward changes in lifestyle brought about by environmental and energy conservation concerns.	4. Logical evolution of program planning.

VII. Conclusions

The following conclusions/observations extrapolate themselves from the preceding analysis. (The sequential listing does not signify a prioritization of issues.)

- Not surprisingly, there is not a monolithic view on any of the four questions in the mini scan.
- In response to Question #1 (most significant change), two predominant factors mentioned were machines (technology) and people (aging population) in that order.
- In response to Question #2, the majority of respondents see a pivotal and more all-encompassing role for the colleges in the years ahead.
- The underfunding of the college system was a recurring refrain reiterated by the mini scan respondents.
- Adaptation of the colleges to accommodate diverse and different student populations was seen as a priority: more adults (seniors, etc.), more disabled students, more women with young children (day care requirements), more immigrants, more undereducated candidates.
- In addition to underfunding, the problems of inappropriate, inflexible funding mechanisms were repeatedly cited along with suggested corrective measures.
- While the colleges have been acrobatically flexible in the past, respondents predict a need for even greater flexibility in the future.
- Much greater emphasis on professional development and training for all college personnel – particularly faculty – is recommended.
- Respondents foresee a symbiotic relationship between colleges and employers in the future for the mutual benefit of both.
- Respondents are divided in their view of the raison d'être of the colleges; some see them as academic institutions in the broad sense; others, as training institutions in the narrow sense; still others see the need for both under the same roof.
- There is some concern expressed about the current system of governance. It is seen to constrain the potential of the colleges.
- There is also a perception that some shifts in emphasis by provincial and federal government departments would assist in optimizing operation of the colleges and consequently provide a better quality of education for the target student populations whom they aim to serve.